HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/literarystructur00unse

T H E S E S

1941

VOLUME I

PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION
LIBRARY
1962

34441

C O N T E N T S

FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

The Literary Structure of Joel 1:1-2:27

Grace Loomis Edwards

Brunner's Criticism of Schleiermacher

Yasutoki Hika

Current Christian Thinking concerning the Relation between Christianity and Democracy

Stephen Hon-Cheung Shek

CONTENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

The Literary Structure of Nobel 121-27

Grace Loomis Bowers

Brummel's Criticism of Schleiermacher

Yasutoki Hike

Current Christian Thinking concerning the Relation
between Christianity and Democracy

Stephen Hon-Cheung Shek

THE CURRENT CHRISTIAN THINKING CONCERNING THE RELATION BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND DEMOCRACY

HON-CHEUNG SHEK

L. Th. Union Theological College, Canton, China, 1931

School of Religion, Yenching University, Peiping, China, 1935

THESIS

Submitted in the Department of
Philosophy of Religion
in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts
in Pacific School of Religion

1941

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER

I. THE MEANING OF DEMOCRACY AND ESSENTIALS OF CHRISTIANITY 7

The meaning of democracy
(1) The general idea of democracy
(2) The real nature of democracy
(3) The applicable theories of democracy
(a) Political (b) Industrial (c) Social
Essentials of Christianity
(1) The principle of "love"
(2) The faith of the "fatherhood of God" and "brotherhood of men"
(3) The ideal of the "Kingdom of God"
(4) The organization of the Christian Church

II. HISTORICAL RELATION BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND CHRISTIANITY 30

The Hebrew theocracy
Tolerance and conflict between Church and State in the Roman Empire
(1) Influence upon theological thinking
(2) Influence upon religious life
Calvin's representative church government in Geneva
French Revolution and the establishment of French Republic
The constitutional monarchy of England
The Constitutional democracy in America
The development of democracy in China

III. MODERN ATTACK ON DEMOCRACY AND THREATS TO CHRISTIANITY 54

Dictatorship of totalitarian states
(1) Fascist Italy (2) Nazi Germany
(3) Pseudo-Fascist Japan (4) Communist Russia
Capitalism and plutocracy
Secularization of Christianity

CHAPTER Page

IV. RECONSTRUCTION OF "DEMOCRATIC CHRISTIANITY" AND "CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY" 68

Practical suggestions from some outstanding world Christian conferences
(1) The Oxford Conference (2) The Madras Conference
Constructive opinions expressed by distinguished contemporary Christian thinkers:
(1) Karl Barth (2) Emil Brunner (3) William Temple (4) Reinhold Niebuhr (5) Jacques Maritain

CONCLUSION 98

BIBLIOGRAPHY 105

INTRODUCTION

As this thesis is written at a time when China, the only democracy in Asia, is engaged in a life and death struggle against the Japanese military invasion, it seems a bit irrelevant to present a discussion which is entirely theoretical. My country's coastal cities have been occupied, her communications have been blocked, her colleges and other cultural institutions have been bombed, and millions of my fellow countrymen have been killed. In other parts of the world the older "democracies" too are on the fighting-line. Some have been destroyed by military aggression, others are threatened internally by social conditions which are the product of a contracting economic system.

History reveals that after the ending of the first World War, with the rise of some political theories and systems other than democracy, the minds of the people were disturbed and civilian opinions were divided. Both democracy and dictatorship have been familiar subjects for discussion or debate in meetings as well as in publications. Some think that to attempt a defense of democracy these days is a little like defending paganism in 313 or the divine right of kings in 1793. Some take for granted that demo-

cracy is bad and that it is dying. Others, however, hold that democracy, though imperfect, is still the best system, and, therefore, show nothing in favor of any proposed changes which are thought by them to be comparatively less close to the ideal. When communist Russia, fascist Italy and nazi Germany appear to be active players on the stage of the political world, all the democratic ideals and democratic nations have to accept a great challenge and face the severe trial of their career. Statesmen, leaders of industry, scholars and students of social sciences are warned to rethink or re-examine all the democratic theories and practices. Critical articles concerning democracy are written and expressed in newspapers, periodicals, pamphlets and books increasingly. Among innumerable titles of writings that are somewhat similar to one another, I need but give a short list of them which, I think, may serve well in suggesting a picture of the psychology of our contemporaries:

Democracy in the World Crisis (Acad. Pol. Sci. Proc., Jan., 1932)

The Present Crisis in Democracy (Foreign Affairs, Jan.1934)

The Alleged Failure of Democracy (Yale Review, Autum 1934)

A Defense of Democracy (Harper's Magazine, Sept., 1934)

Democracy, Is It An Empty Word? (Hibbert Jour. Vol.34,1935)

Adjusting Democracy -- Constitutional or Otherwise? (Am. Scholar, 4:428-63, Oct. 1935)

Democracy Is a National Danger (Il. Sat. R., Sept.5, 1936)

Can Democracy Survive? (World Affairs Interpreter, Summer, 1938)

How Shall Democracy be Saved? (World Christianity, 3rd Quarter, 1938)

Communist and Democracy (Labour Mon. Oct., 1938)

Liberal Democracy Meets Class Struggle (Social R. Oct.1938)

Conflict Between Autocracy and Democracy (Am. J. Int. Law, Oct., 1939)

Democracy at the Cross-roads (Nat. Munic. R. Jan., 1939)

Can Religion Save Democracy? (The Christian Cent. Aug. 1939)

Democracy and Dissent (Pol. Q. 10:571-82, Oct. 1939)

Must Democracy Perish? (Lond. Q.R. Oct. 1939)

Attack on Democracy (The Intercollegian, Nov. 1939)

Democracy and Nazism (Pol. Q. 11:1-15, Jan., 1940)

The Religious Union for Democracy (Protestant Dig. June, 1940)

Democracy, Education and Faith (Yale Divinity News, Nov. 1940)

Writers of the articles like those mentioned above are not necessarily advocates of anti-democracy. In fact, on the contrary, most of them have tried to make a defense of democracy. But just those attractive and stimulating titles clearly enough reflect the restlessness of the modern minds.

As the European War broke out again in 1939, followed by the downfall of Poland, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway and France, and the establishment of the so-called "Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis", international relations have reached so critical a turn that even the most optimistic among us has been forced to realize that our hope for peace, for stability and fair play which can only be secured through a democratic

way, have become little more than wishful thinking. No wonder a New York lawyer is suggested to declare that "it is the time to brush aside this word 'democracy' with its connotations." Indeed, it seems to many that democracy's death knell has been sounded over the wide world by the founders of the totalitarian states!

However, all I have said in the foregoing paragraphs are a general description of people's impressions of and attitudes toward democracy from the political point of view. If you did identify democracy with a type of government, you would naturally make the same pessimistic judgment that I have pointed out in seeing the terrible crisis of that type of government. But when you try to view democracy in a broader sense and look upon it as something more than any kind of static government, you will visualize another brighter and hopeful picture. This is one of the points to be developed further in this paper.

Now what do we think about Christianity with this dark and lifeless picture of clashes between democracy and dictatorship in mind? Both democrats or dictators, I think, have to take Christianity into their consideration. Because, on the one hand, Christianity is conceived as a religion of love, freedom and justice, and even identified with democracy by many. On the other hand, Christianity is proved by history that it has been a unifying force in building

up a nation or in establishing an empire. Thus, for dictators, Christianity is an object either to be exploited or to be done away with; while for democrats, Christianity is regarded as both their close ally and important supporter. Modern Christians, therefore, are forced to feel that they cannot be indifferent to the increasing flood of violence and tyrany of dictatorship and the problem of struggle and survival of democracy. This is the reason why Christianity and democracy are brought together in this paper and studied in terms of their relationship.

What is the attitude of Christianity toward this war-torn world? What should be the reaction of Christianity in facing the menace to and decline of democracy? Is she obliged to meet the trial and share the same lot with democracy? Would Christianity become so pessimistic as to put her candle under a bushel in spite of the darkness of the house? Would she become so discouraged as to dig in the earth and hide the trust money and then wait for the coming of her Lord? Being modern Christians can we accept the ancient view that "in the nature of things democracy is replaced by autocracy; this, in turn, by aristocracy, yielding again to democracy; and so the circle goes on like the phases of the moon?" Is it really possible for Christianity to exist independently of the failure of democracy? If we don't believe the repetition of history itself as an iron rule, if we are realistic enough, what steps then shall we take to find a way out so

that we may see a new vision beyond the chaos, seek a new order out of confusion and help to develop an oasis in the desert of the human world today? All these questions cannot be answered adequately unless we realize the true relation between Christianity and democracy. Therefore, the current Christian thinking concerning the relation between Christianity and democracy should be studied carefully by Christians as well as students of political theories, social ethics and international problems.

So far as the material gathered, and the ideas or suggestions expressed in this paper are concerned, I should say that they are poor and fall short in comparison with the expected exhaustive study which requires years of research and volumes of treatment. To put it in Dr. A. Lawrence Lowell's words, "The subject .... is as vast and complex as any that has occupied the mind in relation to human affairs. It will engage men's thought and fill the time of publicists and historians as long as life endures upon this planet. Anything that one can write about it briefly must be fragmentary and superficial -- at best a touching of a few obvious points, like the description by an aviator of the life in a great city gathered from a flight over its dwellings, temples and skyscrapers, with a vague glimpse of the throngs in the streets.[1]

---

[1] Dr. A. Lawrence Lowell, "The Present Crisis in Democracy", Foreign Affairs, XII.(Jan. 1934)..

CHAPTER I

THE MEANING OF DEMOCRACY AND ESSENTIALS OF CHRISTIANITY

Before we go directly into the study of the relation between Christianity and democracy, we have first to understand the real meaning of democracy and recognize the essentials of Christianity. They are the elements by which our theories are formed; conditions to which our criticism is subjected and the basis upon which our judgments rest. Furthermore, in order to make their significance known and clear to the modern people, they should be studied by a historical method and interpreted in terms of the life situation of our time.

The meaning of democracy.-- The word "democracy" in Greek denotes the idea of a form of government in which the people rule themselves. It is set forth, therefore, in the political sense, as an alternative to monarchy, autocracy, aristocracy and oligarchy. However, democracy should be understood in a broader sense. This point will be developed later when we come to the discussion of the "real nature of democracy".

1. The general idea of democracy.-- As democracy is generally known by its political significance, we always

think of, and interpret it in terms of government. Thus the old phrase of Abraham Lincoln, "government of the people, by the people and for the people," has become the classical definition of democracy. This ideal was, of course, embodied in the opening words of the "Declaration of Independence" which ran:

> We hold these truths to be self evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed . . . .

It was also firmly planted in the Constitution whose first article of the ten amendments set forth the four fundamental freedoms:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

The term, "democracy" reminds us also of the old war cry of the French Revolution, "Liberty, equality and fraternity!" If we trace further back to: (a) John Locke's conception of the "state of nature" and his emphasis upon the limitation of the civil authority;[1] (b) Rousseau's idea of "natural right" and theory of the coincidence of the "general will" and the "will of all";[2] and (c) John Stuart

---

[1] John Locke, Treatise on Civil Government, 1689.

[2] Rousseau, Social Contract, 1762.

Mills's utilitarianism with its principle of the greatest good of the greatest number,[1] it still fastens our attention and thinking within the political category.

In short, the general idea of democracy used to be so concrete and so akin to government that people can hardly see its real nature which is more than any form of political institution.

2. The real nature of democracy.-- What is the real nature of democracy? This is a common urgent question crying from the hearts of the truth-seekers today. Instead of giving it an immediate and direct answer, I would like to put before us the opinions of some of the modern thinkers:

a) Professor Charles E. Merriam of the University of Chicago holds that democracy is that social economy which has five assumptions: (1) The essential dignity of all men and the importance of protecting and cultivating personality primarily on a fraternal rather than on a differential basis; (2) a constant trend in human affairs toward the perfectibility of mankind; (3) the fact that the gains of commonwealths are essentially mass gains and should be diffused through the mass by whom they were created as rapidly and as fairly as possible; (4) the desirability of popular control in the last analysis over basic questions of policy and direction with recognized procedures for the formulation of such policies and their execution; (5) confidence in the

---

[1] John Stuart Mill, Considerations on Representative Government, 1861.

possibility of conscious social change accomplished by consent rather than by violence.[1]

b) Dr. Arthur E. Holt of Chicago Theological Seminary besides favoring Professor Merriam's exposition, suggests three other aspects of democracy: (1) Democracy is the co-operative principle applied to government and economic organization; (2) democracy assumes a free and cooperative relationship between the major functions of society, religion, family life, education, business and politics; (3) democracy is that kind of economy, which when it is through with, leaves you a person of spiritual maturity and it is always more interested in this goal than it is in the perfection of its social organization.[2]

c) Gregory Vlastos, in his Christian Faith and Democracy points out that democracy is based on three principles, namely: the essential dignity of every man, responsibility and justice, and the greatness of the worker.[3]

d) John C. Bennett, in his article Christianity and Democracy presents: (1) the limitation of power; (2) the principle of consent; and (3) freedom of expression for minorities and individuals as three essential elements of demo-

---

[1] Charles E. Merriam, A summary taken from the Federal Council Information Service of an article in the Political Science Quarterly, October, 1938.

[2] Quoted from Dr. Holt's address delivered on the Founders' Day of Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California

[3] Gregory Vlastos, Christian Faith and Democracy, Association Press, 1938, Chapter II.

cracy.[1]

e) John Dewey, in his Democracy of Education expresses the opinion that "a democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience. The extension in space of the number of individuals who participate in an interest so that each has to refer his own action to that of others, and to consider the action of others to give point and direction to his own, is equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory which kept men from perceiving the full impost of their activity.[2]

f) Dean Luther A. Weigle of Yale Divinity School, in his Opening Day address says, ". . . . for democracy is more than a form of government. It is an ethical principle which is not dependent upon any one type of political structure. It may be realized in a monarchy, and may fail in a republic.[3]

g) Professor Ralph Barton Perry of Harvard University, in his article, The Alleged Failure of Democracy remarks that "to say that it (democracy) has failed would be like saying that justice, goodness, or happiness has failed. The fact is that critics of democracy have not, as a rule,

---

[1] J. C. Bennett, "Christianity and Democracy", Christendom, V (2) 1940.

[2] John Dewey, Democracy of Education, Chap. VII, 101

[3] Luther A. Weigle, Address "Democracy, Education and Faith", in Yale Divinity News, XXXVII (2), 1940.

distinguished between democracy as a political means and democracy as a social end."[1]

h) A. D. Lindsay in his The Essentials of Democracy[2] takes Colonel Rainboro's[3] words, "The poorest he that is in England hath a life to live as the richest he," as the authentic note of democracy and thinks that "it is a religious and moral principle." At the same time he points out two of the main mistakes into which we generally used to fall: (1) "We have suffered in the past from making democracy into a dogma, in the sense of thinking of it as something magical, exempt from the ordinary laws which govern human nature"; (2) "We make a great mistake if in considering political democracy we think only of individuals on the one hand and of the political organizations on the other, and neglect the enormous importance in the production of a real public opinion of the innumerable voluntary associations of all kinds which exist in modern democratic societies."

I am sure that these opinions I have introduced above will sufficiently shed some clear light upon the misunderstanding of the nature of democracy. At least we can see now that democracy is something flexible rather than

---

[1] Ralph Barton Perry, "The Alleged Failure of Democracy" Yale Review, Autumn, 1934.

[2] A. D. Lindsay, The Essentials of Democracy, 13, 39-40. 82.

[3] Colonel Rainboro was one of the most prominent of the Levellers, who spoke for the army in the debate between the representatives of the army and the leaders of the government of England held at the Grand Council of Officers at Putney, October 25, 1647. (See Lindsay's The Essentials of Democracy p. 11).

static, something akin to spirit rather than to form. It is a principle, an ideal or a social end that is to be realized in our personal and collective life instead of something to be identified with political systems and social organizations.

3. The applicable theories of democracy.-- Since democracy is as flexible and spiritual as an ethical principle, it is, of course, applicable to any form of human life. To say this in a more concrete way, it can be and has been applied in three phases of our life, namely; political, industrial, and social. For convenience sake, the scholars in social science have suggested three terms;"political democracy", "industrial democracy", and "social democracy" in classifying the study of problems of democracy. Let us give a brief account of each of them:

a) Political democracy.-- The term, "political democracy" itself is obviously suggesting its emphasis upon a certain form of government, especially the government by consent of the governed. Here we have to refer again to Lincoln's famous phrase, "Government of the people, by the people, for the people," which I have mentioned in the previous discussion of the general idea of democracy. On one hand the democratic government lays stress on political equality which means all citizens are equal with respect to the basic rights and obligations of free persons, as well as social welfare which

means the common good, the protection of property and happiness for all; while the people themselves elect their representatives who make and execute the laws. "Concerning political democracy", says Herman Harrell Horne "it should perhaps be emphasized that, as understood today, it involves not merely the consent of the governed, a participation based on a common understanding reached by discussion, and carrying the sense of a common responsibility."[1] Such a political democracy is well represented by the government of the United States of America.

However, when we actually approach the problem of a modern political democracy many more questions will challenge our consideration. Among the important ones, the question of how to check power, even the power of the majority, becomes increasingly serious. Can we check power by means of a constitution? Yes. But how to make the constitution more practical and effective? Can we check power by means of allowing mutual correction among different political parties and social classes? Yes. But how to make people transcend their party-consciousness and class interests? Can we check power by means of promoting the organization of cultural and non-political societies which will be agencies for creating strong public opinion? Yes. But how to make them free from being possibly exploited? All these questions have close relations to both industrial and social democracies. Therefore they should be studied and solved by various ways simultaneously.

---

[1]Herman Harrell Horne, The Democratic Philosophy of Education, p. 111

b) Industrial democracy.[1] -- It is the "industrial revolution" which changes the system of individual domestic handiwork into the system of mass production by machinery in factories, that makes modern social problems more complicated. Because of the rapid expansion of industry and growth of cities, modern industry is generally recognized as being the most important, if not the only factor in the remaking of our civilization. On one hand, organized labor and collective bargaining of the working classes are forceful enough to compel capitalist employers to pay respect, to divide profits, and to improve conditions for the employees. On the other hand, by means of corporations, the social control of machine and the cooperative industry are easily achieved. Thus "industrial democracy" stands out itself as an applied democracy against the background of both the political and social democracy. In order to make the main ideals and principles of the industrial democracy more clear, it may be re-stated as follows:

(1) Primary control over industry should be vested in large part in the organized workers themselves.[2]

(2) The organization of various "cooperative societies" should be effectively promoted.

(3) Industrial democracy means, more specifically, the "universal diffusion of the economic virtues -- temperance, honesty, and truth; the co-operation of the head and hands in an industrial partnership; a just and equitable division

---

[1] It is sometimes called "economic democracy". I use the word "industrial" with the intention of suggesting the historical sense derived from the "industrial revolution".

[2] J. H. Randall, The Making of the Modern Mind, p. [illegible]

of the products of their joint industry between the tool-owners and the tool-users; a fair opportunity for the tool-user to become part owner of the tools that he labors with; growing co-operation between the laborer and the capitalist, or the tool-user and the tool-owner, in both ownership of the tool and the direction of the industry; and a frank recognition of the fundamental truth that every individual is entitled to the product of his individual industry, to a just porportion of the product which in joint industry he has helped to create, and to a participation in that common wealth which, being produced by no individual industry, belongs of right to the entire community."[1]

c) Social democracy.--We have seen, in the foregoing section, that in industrial democracy, industry is to be organized and run by the workers as well as for them under the principle of the substitution of cooperative group enterprises for individual competition. This leads to the demand of the so-called "social democracy" by which the interchanges of thought and action between different groups and classes for their common good are made effective. According to Dr. Joseph A. Leighton, the realization of social democracy in the great industrial society must be based on the following postulates:[2]

> (1) Every individual shall enjoy, within the limits prescribed by decency and non-violence, the right to criticize any person, public or private, and to express his dissent from any actual or proposed policy. Freedom of assembly

---

[1]Lyman Abbott, The Spirit of Democracy, p. 155.

[2]J. A. Leighton, Social Philosophies in Conflict, p. 393.

and publication, as well as inviolability of person, home, and mail shall be guaranteed.

(2) In choosing representatives, and in voting on all matters of public policy, each individual 'literate' citizen, in the possession of his normal powers, shall have one vote and no more.

(3) The Government shall have the power to control private enterprise, or to engage in public enterprise, to the end that the greatest possible equalization of opportunity to realize a good life, that is, consistent with maximal efficiency of production and distribution, shall be enjoyed by all.

Apparently these postulates presuppose an educated people. Therefore, free education open to all classes should be the first thing to do in the program of realizing social democracy. Furthermore, we should bear in mind that in speaking of the personal right and individual enterprise, it is by no means the "laissez-faire" individualism of the capitalistic liberals; and in speaking of government's power to control, it is by no means favoring the absolute government or public ownership of all the means of production and distribution that leads to dictatorship or the establishment of a totalitarian state.

Social democracy should be founded on and created by the cooperation of political leaders, landholders, liberal business men and the working class. Against the background of fascism, communism and nazism, the social democracy is in the making.

Regarding the relation between the political, industrial, and social democracies, I should say that political democracy is the means to be utilized; industrial democracy is the norm to be

developed and social democracy is the end to be achieved in building up an ideal democratic society.

The essentials of Christianity.-- In the preceding discussion, we have observed fundamentally the meaning of democracy. Now we come to the essentials of Christianity. By comparing them with the meaning of democracy, we will be able to understand more clearly their close relationship.

1. The principle of love.--What are the elements essential to Christianity? The first thing that comes to our mind would be, naturally, the principle of "love", which is generally regarded as the heart of Christian religion. One would not be surprised in hearing people speaking about Christianity as the "religion of love" when he recognizes the following facts:

a) The greatest commandment set forth by the Mosaic law in the Old Testament and quoted by Jesus in the New Testament consists of these words: "You must love the Lord your God with your whole heart, your whole soul, your whole mind and your whole strength," and "You must love your neighbour as you do yourself."[1]

b) In Jesus' Sermon on the Mount which has been said to include the moral code of the Kingdom of Heaven, the Mosaic laws give place to the motive and principle of love. This principle is implied and expressed practically in two of the dramatic parables of Jesus: the parable of the Prodigal Son and the par-

---

[1] Deut. 6: 5; Lev. 19: 18 cf Matt. 22: 35-39; Mark 12: 29-31; Luke 10: 25.

able of the Good Samaritan, and best of all, it finds its highest expression in Jesus' death on the cross which becomes a symbol of the Christian religion.

c) St. Paul devoted a whole chapter, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, in commentating the meaning and significance of love with the conclusion that love is the greatest in comparison with faith and hope.[1]

d) The author of the First Epistle of John gives us these more clear statements:[2]

> Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God, and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love . . . . And we have known and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him.

In order to make clear the meaning of this principle of love which is essential to the teachings of Jesus, Paul and the writer of First John, I should like to present these comments from some of our outstanding Christian thinkers:

> Shailer Mathews: God is love, and love is the only practicable way of life .... Men need economic goods. 'Seek first brotherliness convinced of God's fatherliness', says Jesus, 'and these things shall be added to you.' Men want to live at peace with mankind, to be reconciled with their enemies. 'Love them', says Jesus, 'don't fight them. Treat them as you would like to have them treat you.' Men wish to be forgiven by God. 'That is impossible,' says Jesus 'until you forgive men the injuries they have done you.' Women want personal rights. 'Treat them as persons' says Jesus, 'and distrust evil desire.' Men want justice given them. 'First', says Jesus, 'give justice to others.'[3]
>
> William Adams Brown: Love, as Paul conceives it, is an attitude of the spirit in which one so identifies himself

---

[1] I Cor. Chapter 13

[2] I John 4: 7, 8, 16.

[3] Shailer Mathews, The Faith of Modernism, pp. 147-148

> with the life of another as to rejoice in the success of that other as if it were his own. It is an attitude of humility and gentleness, of sympathy and understanding, of generous recognition of whatever is good wherever it is found. It is the attitude which Jesus himself exemplified in his own life and which he holds up as the model for all men because it expresses the nature of God himself. Love then, -- the love that is not mere blind affection but the creative will to good -- becomes the law of life in the Kingdom.[1]

> Arthur E. Holt: Love is the dynamic of the Christian society. And out of it arises an experience of social trust which holds men together . . . . There is a bond which binds more firmly and more lastingly than any of these (race and class, geography and nationality), though it is less tangible. That bond is the unity of those who trust one another, who rely on that integrity which roots in the fact that all are loyal to a constant which demands trustworthiness of each. This is basic to any society which would advance beyond the beggarly notions of race and class, geography and nationality . . . . . The society held together by love and mutual confidence might be described as a society of friends.[2]

It is obvious that the principle of love is so creative and practical that it cannot and should not be independent of ethical activities. This is the reason why Jesus, on one hand, makes the mercifulness and forgiveness of God known to all and on the other hand, lays emphasis upon the idea of judgment. In fact, the messages concerning judgment and punishment recorded in the Synoptic Gospels are nearly three times as great as those concerning forgiveness and love. Paul did also lay stress on Christian ethics[3], in spite of his doctrine of justification by faith; while the authors of the Catholic Epistles[4] in the

---

[1] W. A. Brown, Beliefs that Matter, pp. 59-60

[2] A. E. Holt, This Nation Under God, pp. 200-201

[3] Thess. 4: 1-12; 5: 12-22; Gal. 5: 13-25; Romans 1: 18; 3: 20; 12: 1-20; 13: 8-10; Phil. 2: 1-18; 4: 8-9; Col. 3: 12-15; Eph. 4: 1-21.

[4] James 1:22-27; I John 2: 3-11; II John 4-6.

New Testament, especially the Epistle of James, fought intolerantly against the so-called "antinomianism" which is simply the result of the failure of applying the principle of love in the Christian ethical life.

2. The faith of the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of men.-- God may be conceived as an Absolute, a First Cause, a First Mover, a Cosmic Law, a Creative Force, a Process, a Spirit or a Creator who is omnipotent, omnipresent and omniscient, but none of these religious concepts is higher than the faith of the fatherhood of God. The word "fatherhood" indicates the ethical relationship between God and man which meets the needs of the human soul better than anything of the "deistic" or "pantheistic" exposition. However, the idea of the fatherhood of God may still be very abstract rather than the faith of a Heavenly Father revealed by Jesus. Chinese people used to call their emperor the Son of Heaven, and the philosopher Chang Tsai (1020-1077 A.D.) of the Sung Dynasty, taught the conception of "Heaven, the Father, and Earth, the Mother", yet no concrete idea of personality of God was conceived. Even the fatherhood of God in the Hebrew teaching that denotes the relationship of God to the collective Israelites, is far less concrete than the "Father of Jesus" who cares for individuals as his children individually. Thus, the faith of the fatherhood of God in Christianity has consisted of at least two important conceptions:

a) God is personal.-- God is neither the impersonal

"Principle of Concretion" of Dr. Alfred N. Whitehead, nor the "Process of Interaction" of Dr. H. N. Wieman, nor the "Wholly Other" of Dr. Otto.[1] God is personal. This does not mean that God is a person, for God is more than anthropomorphic. Our human limitations cannot apply to Him. Dr. J. C. Bennett points out that "those characteristics which do apply to God are; awareness, intelligence, purposiveness, the capacity to appreciate, the capacity to response to persons."[2] According to Dr. Shailer Mathews, "we need to feel the uplift of a God who is Himself sharing in men's struggle to complete a world of personal values and thus directing the divine process toward the truly personal ..... To approach Him is not to approach a metaphysical Absolute or a Force not ourselves making for righteousness . . . . . Nor is it to approach a spectral personification of human values. It is to approach God as the undefined Person immanent in the universe in some such a way as we finite persons are related to our bodies, upon whose good will humanity can rest in its anxieties and sorrows, its discontents and its aspirations; who works in evolution and human history; who is as loving and sympathetic as Jesus Christ; to whom we can pray with full trust in His power and love; who justifies our attempt to be loving; who helps and transforms us."[3]

---

[1] Dr. A. N. Whitehead, Process and Reality, Cambridge 1929, p. 523; Dr. H. N. Wieman, The Issue of Life, Abingdon, 1930, p. 178; W. M. Horton, Contemporary Continental Theology, pp. 91-99.

[2] Dr. J. C. Bennett, Christianity and Our World, p. 7

[3] Dr. S. Mathews, The Faith of Modernism, pp. 120-121

b) God as a loving Father capable of having personal relations with individuals.-- There is a direct ethical relation existing between God and every human being. God is the Father who cares for individuals as individuals. This ethical relation is well explained by the idea of "the 'I-Thou' relationship" expressed in Martin Buber's little book, I and Thou. Dr Walter Marshall Horton makes a clear commentary on this point as he says, "A God who is a mere 'object' of thought, a mere 'He' or 'It' is not God at all; only to man, who, standing in Kierkegaard's 'existential moment', says, 'Thou' to God, and finds himself held personally responsible in God's sight -- only to such a one does the dimension of deity ever truely open up."[1]

It is this conception of the fatherhood of God that gives fundamental support to the idea of the brotherhood of men. Men are brothers because they are children of God who is the Father of all. The brotherhood of men, therefore, presupposes the fatherhood of God. The brotherhood of men is vital to Christian faith because it implies equality of the human race on one hand, and assures mutual love among people of all sorts on the other. Both equality of human personality before God and mutual love among men are the basis upon which Christian ethics is built, Through the faith of brotherhood of men the following ideals are possibly made real:

(1) The practice of the positive Golden Rule of Jesus: "You must always treat other people as you would like

---

[1] Dr. W. M. Horton, Contemporary Continental Theology, p.92

to have them treat you."[1]

(2) Everyone is a true neighbor to those in need and nobody would ask: "Am I my brother's keeper?"[2]

(3) The establishment of a world-community according to the pattern of a great family in which all are equal in spite of the fundamental difference of sex, the intellectual chasm between the educated and the uneducated, and the physical diversity between the stron and the weak.

3. The ideal of the "Kingdom of God".-- When Jesus began his ministry in Galilee, he preached the gospel of the Kingdom of God saying, "The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand." "The Kingdom of God continued to be the center of all His teaching as recorded by the Synoptic Gospels," points out Walter Rauschenbusch, "His parables, His moral instructions and his prophetic predictions all bear on that."[3]

Historically speaking, the term "Kingdom of God" is originally related to the old Jewish belief of a Messianic Kingdom which is a New Age to come when the reign of God will be fully manifested, the glory of Israel will be restored, and social justice, prosperity and happiness will prevail. Also, there has been added to this belief some other elements

---

[1] Matt. 7: 12, An American translation by E. J. Goodspeed

[2] Gen. 4: 9, An American translation by J. M. P. Smith.

[3] W. Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Crisis p. 54

of apocalyptic expectation and eschatological significanes of the later traditions denoting the Divine intervention and consummation of the theocratic hope. Jesus might have shared more or less the religious faith of his time, but so far as the idea of the Kingdom of God is concerned, He spoke of it not without considerable modification. At least he did exhibit some other aspects with a new emphasis:

a) He tried to bring his fellow countrymen out of their fanaticism about the coming of the divine catastrophe of judgment, no matter how near it might be, and, at the same time, he put the emphasis upon the growth of the new life that was now going on. "The Kingdom of God," He says, "is within you."[1] His parables of the mustard-seed and the leaven also suggest how the elements of the Kingdom of God are operating in the present world.

b) He made the Jewish national hope universal. "People will come from the east and west and the north and south, and take their places in the Kingdom of God."[2] This made Paul declare that "there is no room for 'Jew' and 'Greek'; there is no room for 'slave' and 'freeman'; there is no room for 'male' and 'female'; for in union in Christ you are one."[3]

c) He revealed the nature of the Kingdom in a model prayer implying: (1) God's will be done on earth as it is done in heaven; (2) human needs are to be met; (3) forgiveness and love are to be practiced; (4) temptations and evils are to be excluded.

---

[1]Luke 17: 21. [2]Luke 13: 29. [3]Galatians 3: 28.

d) Against the background of a miraculous appearance of the Messianic Kingdom, He recognized God as the Creator of or Initiator in the Kingdom, He called for people's repentance which is the condition for entrance into the Kingdom, and he taught the ethical principles and moral traits which demand human action or cooperation in their realization. This is clearly seen in His Sermon on the Mount.

So far it is sufficient for us to see how the coming of the Kingdom is possibly linked up with the idea of progress, how it produces Christian utopia in history, how it gives rise to the social gospel and how it still makes all the followers of Jesus keep before them the vision of an ideal society to be established. In fact, the ideal of the "Kingdom of God" stands as a divine transcendental criterion by which we criticize every social order.

4. The organization of the Christian Church.-- According to the New Testament records, the primitive churches were organized on the basis of the rights of election, church discipline and self-government. Although the church developed into a system of parishional bishoprics and finally culminated in the absolutism of the papacy, there arose within the body of the church a movement which went away from absolutism. This was the "Conciliar Movement" of the fifteenth century which developed out of the thought of both Marsiglio of Padua (1270-1340) and William of Ockam (1280-1347), and came to the front in the thought of John Gerson (1363-1429). We know that "the

decree of the Council of Constance (1414-1417), asserting its superiority to the pope, has been called the most revolutionay official document in the history of the world. It marked the culmination of the medieval effort to replace the Roman ideal of authority vested in a single divine ordained head by that of a popularly-based representative assembly. It foreshadowed the later political contest between autocracy and constitutional principles in the state."[1] After all the church is the body of Christ in which "its parts all alike care for one another."[2] "You know that the rulers of the heathen lord it over them and their great men tyrannize over them," says Jesus, "it is not so among you, but whoever wants to be great among you must be your servant."[3] This principle gave support to the policy of the Calvinistic churches and put both the Catholic imperial and the Lutheran alliance with the political administration of Germany in a position hard to defend. It also makes the modern Christian leaders promote the church-union movement with the purpose of rebuilding the great "Family of God" in the world.

Dr. William Adams Brown reminds us that "clear thinking about the church requires us to distinguish two senses in which the word 'church' is used. In one sense, the church is a society of persons who share certain religious

---

[1] Raymond G. Gettell, History of Political Thought, pp. 133-135.

[2] I Cor. 12: 25.

[3] Matt. 20: 25-26

ideal and experience. In another sense, the church is an organization through which these ideals and experience find expression."[1] Say it in a more positive way, "the mission of the church will thus always be two-fold, the perfecting of personal character and the transformation and rebuilding of the social fabric."[2]

Apparently the church exists not for its own sake. It is an instrument or a means rather than an end. It cannot substitute itself for the Kingdom of God. "She is simply a working organization", says Rauschenbusch, "to create the Christian life in individuals and the Kingdom of God in human society."[3]

Democratic fellowship and mutual friendship can be secured within the church, yet, at the same time, social services and community projects can be one for the common people outside the regular channels of the church. The church nurtures attitudes and aspirations which develop in social and political programs outside of the church. As Dr. Bennett has said, "the growth of a world-wide Christian church is necessary for the development of countless persons in every culture and as a community which transcends and moderates every social conflict."[4] In short, the organization of the Christian

---

[1] W. A. Brown, Beliefs that Matter, p. 184.

[2] Rufus M. Jones, Christian Faith in a New Age, p. 172.

[3] W. Rauschenbusch, Christianity and Social Crisis, p.185.

[4] Dr. J. C. Bennett, "I Think ...." in Intercollegian and Far Horizons, Vol. 57, No. 2, November 1939.

church has been and is to be an important factor in the establishment of an ideal new world order.

Bringing together all the essentials of Christianity as discussed in this chapter, we can easily see how Christianity has shown a definite and firm faith in the dignity and possibility of man which are the basis of its doctrine of both individual and social salvation, as well as the fundamental principle and chief concern of democracy.

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL RELATION BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND CHRISTIANITY

The Hebrew theocracy.-- Since the Old Testament becomes a part of the Christian Holy Scripture and Christianity owes much of its religious tradition and faith to the Hebrew religion, we have to trace historically the relation between democracy and Christianity back to the Hebrew theocracy. The word "theocracy", which means the government or a state in which God is the sovereign, seems to us literally in contradiction to democracy. As a matter of fact, democracy finds good expression through theocracy, because under God's sovereignty men are equal subjects. Both the King appointed by the prophet who is regarded as the representative of God, and the people chosen by God are under the same judgment of God. God demands as much righteousness, justice and love of the common people as of the King and Judges. Thus the power of the human rulers is limited, and at the same time the individual's rights are sanctified and protected. This makes Dr. Bennett point out that "the limitation of political power is rooted not, first of all, in democracy, but in theocracy."[1]

Professor Gregory Vlastos, in his little volume, Christian Faith and Democracy, gives us an interesting example

---

[1] Dr. J. C. Bennett, "Christianity and Democracy" Christendom, V (2) Spring 1940.

of how an absolute monarch's power is limited by the commoner's inalienable rights in a little kingdom of Palestine:

> Ahab, the King of Israel, covets the vineyard of one of his subjects. He offers to buy it. But Neboth refuses the offer, knowing perhaps how unequal would be the bargain when the seller is a commoner and the buyer a king. He clings to a man's ancient right to refuse the alienation of the family land: "The Lord forbid it me, that I should give the inheritance of my fathers unto thee." And the king is balked. There is nothing he can do about it. He goes home and sulks: "And he laid him down upon his bed, and turned away his face, and would eat no bread." On Jezebel's (the Queen's) instructions and with the connivance of the nobles of the capital, Naboth is accused of blashphemy and sedition, and stoned to death. So "Jezebel said to Ahab, arise, take possession of the vineyard of Naboth the Jezreelite, which he refused to give thee for money: for Naboth is not alive, but dead." "But the word of the Lord came to Elijah the Tishbite." At the very moment when the king is taking possession of the murdered man's vineyard, Elijah is to meet him and deliver the following message: Thus said the Lord, Hast thou killed and taken possession? . . . . . In the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth shall dogs lick they blood, even thine.[1]

Apparently the commoner of the ancient little kingdom in Palestine has rights, so clear-cut and so well established, that not even the king can override him. Besides, the spirit of the Hebrew theocracy is expressed in the following facts:

(1) God rules the Israelites by making a common covenant with them instead of exercising His almighty force over them dictatorially. He made covenants with Abraham and Jacob. He made covenants with the "elected" people through Moses and their political leaders.

(2) The prophets like Amos, Micah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel,

---

[1]Gregory Vlastos, Christian Faith and Democracy, Association, 1938, 16-17.

etc. possessed the divine authority to warn the prices or rulers of the house of Israel and stand and speak for the laborers, farmers, and the poor and the oppressed.

(3) The Hebrew law, the Book of Deuteronomy and the Book of Leviticus, for example, are largely in accordance with the preaching of the prophets, manifest a striking sympathy for the poorer classes and an unflagging respect for their equal humanity. This is seen in the principles like the control and distribution of land, the prompt payment of wages, the Sabbath-law and the ideal of the "Year of Jubilee".[1]

The tolerance and conflict between Church and State in the Roman Empire.-- Since Constantine, the Roman Emperor, issued a general exhortation to all his subjects to embrace Christianity in 325 A.D. and made Christianity the religion of his court or a state religion, Christians were, no doubt, enjoying their full liberty and were favored in every way. Churches were widely built and ministers were specially honored. Thus the establishment of Christianity meant, on one hand, the full submission by Christians to the Emperor's sovereignty, and on the other hand, it involved the recognition by the State of this organization and its spiritual authority. Because of this, the conflict between Church and State had inevitably taken place in the successive generations. Examples may be seen in the fact that in the late fourth century, St. Ambrose wrote to the Emperor Valentinican II to remind him that in matters of faith it belonged to the bishop to judge Christian

---

[1] Lev. 25; Deut 24: 14-15; Lev. 19: 13; Ex. 23: 12.

emperors, not to emperors to judge bishops. 'The Emperor is within the Church, not above it." He withheld the Eucharist even from Theodosius the Great. He refused to surrender a church by a demand in the name of the Emperor with these words: "The palaces belong to the Emperor, the churches to the priesthood."[1] In the letters and tractates of Pope Gelasius I, at the end of the fifth century, we find that he expressed the opinion that the Emperor is the son of the Church, not its director. He has to learn the matters of religion instead of to teach them, because God wills that dispositions for the Church should belong to the clergy, not to the secular powers.[2]

Through a long period of conflict between the Church and State, it had considerable influence directly or indirectly upon both the theological thinking and religious life in the Christian Church:

(1) In theological thinking, it paved the way for the revival of Neo-Platonism. This is seen in the faith of the church fathers. We may find the best example in St. Augustine's famous writing City of God. The author interprets human existence and human history in terms of a conflict between the City of God and the earthly City. All good and faithful Christians belong to the City of God, while the bad Christians and non-Christians belong to the earthly city. For this point, James Westfall Thompson and Edgar Nathaniel Johnson

---

[1] Carlyle, History of Mediaeval Political Theory I, pp. 148-149

[2] Charles Howard McIlwain, The Growth of Political Thought in the West, (Memillan 1932) 164.

give us a clear explanation:[1]

> Augustine inclines to identify the Civitas Dei (City of God) with the organized Church of his day, and the Civitas Terrena (Earthly City) with the Roman Empire. The end of the conflict, towards which all human history is leading, is the Last Judgment, when the citizens of the true kingdom will be rewarded with its most precious gift, immortality; while the false kingdom will be destroyed and its citizens condemned to everlasting fire . . . . . Therefore the Church which leading its faithful to this glorious end, is the world supreme institution and the chief purpose of the State is to assist the Church."

This idea of two cities co-mixed in the world until a general judgment that will separate them is obviously Neo-Platonism upon which also the later Calvinistic conceptions of the "visible Church" and "invisible Church", and all the dualistic views of Christian life are built.

(2) In religious life, it paved the way for the practice of monasticism and experiments of communistic communities. Of course one may trace the rise of monasticism back to much earlier times and ascribe it to many factors, like social impurity, Oriental asceticism and imperial persecution of the earlier period. Yet the conflict between Church and State after Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire and could not satisfy the spiritual need of the zealous Christians, played a considerable part in the development of the monasticism. F. J. Foakes Jackson points ou that "St. Basil, the great Bishop of Caesarea (ab. 379), organized the monastic communities in his diocese and furnished them with his rules which have since

---

[1] J. W. Thompson and E. N. Johnson, An Introduction to Medieval Europe, (Norton 1937) 62-63.

become the normal standard of Christian monasticism in the East." And "the great epoch of Western monasticism, however, began in the sixth century with St. Benedict of Nursia, the founder of the celebrated Benedictine rule,"[1] which includes:

a) Quasi-military obedience -- like the Roman republican army, like every army under the healthiest national conditions, this order comprehends all sorts and conditions of men. Freemen and serfs may rub shoulders there. Nobles and poor men are considered alike. All are to start upon the same level; each is to be promoted, or to remain subordinate, according to his capacity as a monk.

b) Labor -- hard work is essential to soul-health. It comprises mainly handiwork, and domestic duties, especially field-labor and kitchen-work. Besides, three hours' reading every day.

c) Prayer -- public prayer must be brief; the whole Psalter must be chanted from end to end during the week.

d) Self-denial -- including three essential points: poverty; obedience; and chastity.

Other experiments of communistic communities were found in the later period either in the form of organized movements of different sects or in the life of monasteries. R.Pascal in his lecture on "Communism in the Middle Age and Reformation" gives us quite a number of examples with des-

---

[1] F. J. Foakes Jackson, An Introduction to the History of Christianity, (Memillan 1921) p. 6.

criptions in detail. I should like to extract a few of them here:[1]

(1) The Catharan movement which renounces all earthly possessions and praises poverty, found an excellent expression in the South of France, in the lands of Counts of Tonlouse. Under the tolerance of the Counts, it found thousands of adherents there toward the end of the twelfth century.

(2) The Franciscans' religion of poverty also found hearts attuned to it. About fifty years after the start of the movement, it is reckoned that more than 1100 monasteries of the Grey Friars existed, comprising between 20,000 and 30,000 members.

(3) The movement of Waldenses started by Peter Waldo, spread widely in Northern and Middle Europe, in the Netherlands, along the Rhine, in Saxony, Austria Bohemia, Bavaria and Moravia. It is best known through groups of the "Poor Men of Lombardy" established in Italy and the "Poor Men of Lyon" in France. Besides opposing the use of force and repudiating war, they claimed a due social position for women.

(4) The Taborite movement in Bohemia founded a strong center at Tabor, forming a community where certain communistic measures were carried out. Deacons were charged with the collection and distribution of goods, thus establishing greater equality of consumation between rich and poor. They forbade luxury. Nobles, peasantry, city-patricians and lower classes

---

[1] R. Pascal, Lecture contained in Christianity and the Social Revolution, (Scribner's 1936) Chapter V, pp. 128-162.

in Bohemia were united in trying to overthrow their ruler, the emperor, and to establish a church of their own in place of the papacy.

To consider the situation in these periods of conflict between Church and State as a whole, one almost sees a dialectical development of democratic ideals. If the "thesis" can be ascribed to the ascetic life in monasteries which emphasizes "other-worldliness", then the communistic movements which emphasize material security and welfare of the community, may be regarded as its "antithesis". The "synthesis", therefore, would be some democratic ideal which balances the extremes and emphasizes the mutual adjustment between spiritual and secular powers.

Calvin's representative church government in Geneva.-- We know that the Reformation resulted in destroying the hierarchical religion of Rome and in rejecting the asceticism of the time. One of the urgent needs in the following period would be, then, some administration or discipline to be established as means for preventing anarchy in social and religious life. Against this timely need the Calvinistic representative church government in Geneva came into existence. In his Institutes of the Christian Religion John Calvin remarks frankly that "this civil government is designed, as long as we live in this world, to cherish and support the external worship of God, to preserve the pure doctrine of religion, to defend the constitution of the Church, to regulate our

lives in a manner requisite for society of men, to form our manners to civil justice, to promote our concord with each other, and to establish general peace and tranquility; all which I confess to be superfluous if the kingdom of God, as it is now exists in us, extinguishes the present life. But if it is the will of God, that while we are aspiring towards our true country, we be pilgrims on the earth, and if such aids are necessary to our pilgrimage, they who take them from man deprive him of his human nature."[1] And among the three forms of government, namely, monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, Calvin points out that "it is true that the transition is easy from monarchy to despotism; it is not much more difficult from aristocracy to oligarchy, or the faction of a few; but it is most easy of all from democracy to sedition." To him, therefore, "either aristocracy, or a mixture of aristocracy and democracy far excels all others." "The vice or imperfection of men," he continues, "therefore renders it safer and tolerable for the government to be in the hands of many, that they may afford each other mutual assistance and admonition, and that if any one arrogate to himself more than is right, the many may act as censors and masters to restrain his ambition. This has always been proved by experience, and the Lord confirmed it by his authority, when he established a government of this kind among the people of Israel, with a view to preserve them in the most desirable condition, till

---

[1] John Calvin, The Institutes of the Christian Religion trans. John Allen (1936) II, Chapter XX, 772,

he exhibited in David a type of Christ."[1] This makes Dr. Randall claim that "Calvin himself favored an aristocratic theocracy, but in established monarchies he advocated constitutionalism, and resistance to the king, not by private men, but by elected magistrates entrusted with the guardianship of the people's right."[2]

In establishing the new government in Geneva, Calvin was guided by two fundamental principles, as pointed out by M. Guizot[3]: (1) The distinction (not separation) between religious and civil society; that is, between Church and State -- emphasis laid upon "an alliance between two societies, two powers, each independent of the other in its own domain, but combining in action, and giving each other mutual support." (2) "The amendment and religious discipline of the life and morals of all members of the Church, who were to be placed under the inspection of the ecclesiastical powers, and subjected to their authority, with recourse, in extreme cases, to the civil power."

The following six points will sufficiently provide us with a picture of the so-called "Calvinistic Representative Church Government" in Geneva, and reveal, to a certain extent, their democratic character:

(1) All citizens in Geneva were regarded as Church members.

(2) Four clubs were established as places for young

---

[1] Ibid. 778

[2] J. H. Randall, The Making of the Modern Mind, 189

[3] M. Guizot, Saint Louis and Calvin, 259-260

men and fathers of families to meet and discuss all matters relating to the commonwealth.

(3) Two supreme courts were instituted: (a) The Venerable Company, composed of professors of theology and ministers were in charge of the spiritual and ecclesiastical tasks, at the same time acted as members of the Consistory; (b) The Consistory composed of ministers and lay elders, which dominated the secular councils.

(4) The lay elders, twelve in number, who were appointed annually from the various city councils, were responsible for visiting families and investigating sins in the private life of the citizens.

(5) All offenders of ecclesiastical rules and civil laws were brought up for trial before the Consistory.

(6) The relation between and functions of the Venerable Company, the Consistory and the council were kept as cooperative and harmonious as possible.

Of course from the modern democratic point of view Calvin's experiment in making the Church an organ of civic government at Geneva was not a satisfactory one. But it did make a considerable contribution in the mutual adjustment during later periods. Even the constitutional democracy in the United States today owes its background to this so-called "Calvinistic Representative Church Government".

The French Revolution and the establishment of French Republic.-- As the successes of Reformation, Renaissance and the Calvinistic Church Government in Geneva had created a new spirit or new faith which was making itself felt throughout Europe, the French people, who were kept in the shackles of tradition, old hierarchic order of caste and station of life, could not certainly be indifferent to the happenings of the outside world. In short, a kind of restlessness in both religious and political fields was giving the way to revolution. When the Revolution actually broke out, it was supported first by a large number of the inferior clergy of the Roman Catholic Church, which was the supreme historic religious organization in France. The fact is, as pointed out by A. Aulard in his Christianity and the French Revolution that 'in the States-General at Versailles, when the Third Estate quarrelled with the two privileged Estates over the verification of 'powers' and the nobles, refusing to verify them together, formed a separate Chamber, the clergy did not wish to form a separate Chamber. They waited, they tacked about -- they did not pronounce against the Third Estate nor against the revolutionary idea of the union of the orders -- and finally, by a majority, and with acclamation, they took the side of the Third Estate, in favor of the Revolution. Their position in all its stages was public, impressive and influential."[1]

---

[1] A. Aulard, Christianity and the French Revolution, 47

Between July 14, 1789, the outbreak of the first Revolution, and August 31, 1871, when the National Assembly drew up a constitution for the country, there were two Revolutions. The second Revolution in 1830 and the third Revolution in 1848, took place, besides the revolt of the Commune of Paris just before the title of President of the French Republic was conferred on Thiers. Indeed, a great price has been paid by the French people for gaining the honor of the title "the teacher of Republicanism to mankind."[1]

In order to throw a little more light on the relation between Christianity and the French Revolution, and the Constitution of the Republic, which was proclaimed on September 4, 1870, fixed by constitutional laws in 1875, and amended in 1879, 1884 and 1926, I should like to call our attention to some of the historical influential factors:

(1) The "Declaration of the Rights of Man" which ran:"No one is to be molested for his opinions, even his religious opinions, provided that their manifestation does not disturb public order established by the law."[2]

(2) The "Civil Constitution of the Clergy" voted and announced on July 12, 1790, which asserted "only one way of appointment -- to bishopric and parishes will be recognised and that is the method of election."[3] According to A. Aulard's

---

[1] H. G. Wells, The Outline of History (new, revised ed. complete in one volume, 1931) 928.

[2] Aulard, op. cit., p. 51

[3] Ibid., p. 59

comment, "Bishops were to be nominated by the electors of departments -- the same electors who nominated the members of the departmental Assembly. Parish priests were to be nominated by the electors of the district -- the same who nominated the members of the district Assembly. In this way non-Catholics were allowed to elect the ministers of the Catholic religion."[1]

(3) The proclamation of the liberty of worship. Robespierre, who was an important figure of the Committee of Public Safety, and regarded as the head of the government, said in the Convention on 6th Frimaire of the Year II: "I desire that there be no more anti-religious masquerades before the Convention." Then on 15th Frimaire the Convention decreed that "all violence and measures against liberty of worship are forbidden."[2]

All the so-called "Rights of Man", "method of election" and "liberty of worship" mentioned in these points are no doubt essential to democracy. In fact, they have been introduced into and adopted by the constitution of the French Republic.

The constitutional monarchy of England.-- In treating the history of democracy in England, one usually starts at the opening of the nineteenth century, beginning with the Parliamentary Reform of 1832 when the middle classes gained

---

[1] Ibid., p. 60

[2] Ibid., pp. 113-114

representation in Parliament. However, so far as the political democracy is concerned, we may trace it even back to the seventeenth century when the Levellers had actually expressed in their remarkable pamphlet "The Light Shining in Buckingham-shire" these ideals:[1] (1) a just portion for each man to live, so that none need to beg or steal for want, but everyone may live comfortably; (2) a just rule for each man to go by, which rule is to be found in Scripture; (3) equal rights; (4) government judges elected by all the people; (5) a commonwealth "after the pattern of the Bible."

Furthermore, from the point of view of the relation of Christianity to the British Parliamentary government, we cannot overlook, at least two historical movements before the Reform Act of 1832, namely: (1) The movement to obtain equal political rights for Roman Catholics in Ireland which resulted in the passing through Parliament of a "Catholic Emancipation Bill" in 1829; (2) Tory Reforms -- although Toryism becomes one of the ingredients of Conservatism of the later Conservative party -- by which the accomplishment of (a) the revision of Criminal Law, (b) the approval of Trade Union, and (c) the removal of Religious Disabilities were made possible and effective.

Democracy in England was obtained through a long evolving process and its development was never completed until the year 1918 when the right of women to vote was allowed.

---

[1]John Lewis, Christianity and the Social Revolution Part I, Chap. VI, p. 168

Regarding the British Constitution, it is not more than a miscellany consisting of different "Bills" and "Acts", -- from old international treaties, like Magna Carta (1215) to the Parliamentary Act (1911) and countless other statutes -- but at the same time it is flexible and ever-evolving.[1] What is worthy of our attention is the suggestion of Professor Ernest Barker, according to whom, "the parliamentary constitution of England as shaped under Simon de Montfort may owe no little to the influence of the constitution of the Dominican Order of the thirteenth century."[2]

"While the king still remains the chief dignitary of the state," says Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes, "and the House of Lords still wields a two-year suspensive veto in legislation in addition to exercising judicial functions as supreme court of appeal, the dominant force in the British polity is democracy represented by the House of Commons,"[3] which consists of 670 representatives elected by universal suffrage.

The relation between Christianity and democracy in England is to be understood not by counting the representatives of churches, especially bishops of the Anglican Church, in the House of Lords, but by considering the freedom and justice seen in the political, social, economic, cultural, moral and religious life of the people.

---

[1]Carlton J. Hayes, A Political and Social History of Modern Europe, p. 291.

[2]George Catlin, The Story of Political Philosophers, 264

[3]Hayes, op. cit. p. 292.

The constitutional democracy in America.-- All of us know that America owes much of its religious and cultural background to the European countries. The history of migration tells us that to Massachusetts came the Englishman; to New York, the Dutch; to Delaware, the Swede; to Pennsylvania, the Quaker, the Scotchman, the Welsh and the German; to Virginia, the Cavalier; to Georgia, the Huguenot; to Florida, the Spaniard; to Louisiana, the French, etc. Indeed, America is the greatest "melting-pot" of the world. It is a melting-pot not because it possesses the irresistible force of dictatorship like the European monarchism, but because it inherits the spirit and principle of democracy which is rooted in the Christian religion of its Pilgrim Fathers. The spirit which took expression in the cabin of the "Mayflower" is the spirit which has dominated America to this day.

In my description of the general idea of democracy in the foregoing chapter, I have mentioned the "Declaration of Independence" and the 'Constitution" which are the foundation of American democracy so far as political theory is concerned. It is by the relationship sustained by the Congress (the House of Representatives and the Senate), the President, and an independent Supreme Court that the United States, through this system of "checks and balances," has been able to achieve a minimum of political democracy. It is through the correction or mutual stimulation of each

other of the parties of Democrats, Republicans and Independents, that the political machine of the United States is always able to keep itself in line with the democratic ideals. Being the historical religious movement and organization, Christianity has naturally played an important role in promoting and strengthening democracy in America.

Dr. Arthur E. Holt points out that the Christian Church has been concerned not only with private piety but also with the ethical phases of public problems during the four periods in American history: (1) The period of theocracy, when men tried to establish and define a commonwealth founded on the word of God and designed to benefit man; (2) the period prior to the election of Thomas Jefferson, when citizenship privileges of the United States were extended to the common man and the separation of church and state took place; (3) the period of the "roaring '40's" prior to the Civil War, when the issues were the freeing of the slaves and the preservation of the Union; (4) the present time when the issues are the social control of capitalism, international and interracial peace and the preservation of democracy.[1] Just by studying the first social creed of the American church set forth in 1679, to the new social creed adopted at Indianapolis Meeting of Federal Council of Churches 1932, one can see how the elements of the problems of social well-being,

---

[1] Dr. Arthur E. Holt, This Nation Under God, pp. 177-178

labor conditions, monetary systems, industrial and agricultural problems, urban and rural considerations, and the repudiation of war are gradually added to the working Christian ideals.

It is true to say that modern democracy owes its foundation to the French Republic, and its historical experiment to the English constitutional monarchy, but finds its full expression in the United States of America. Many reasons can be given for the special achievement of the United States, yet the practical freedom and rights granted to the people, free education open to all classes, equal chances provided for every plain man to realize his ambition, geographical frontiers for the immigrants, natural and varied abundance, together with the richness of the Christian spiritual heritage, are the factors that did enable her people, which comprises only seven percent of the world's population, control more than forty-five percent of the world's wealth, and her government to try every means to carry out experiments of democratic ideals in all spheres of life. Today in more than half the world freedom does not exist. Most of the peoples in the world have lost their hope concerning the future of democracy. The contribution that American democracy makes to the world now is not only the material support for the oppressed or invaded nations, but particularly her faith in and conviction about democracy

which encourage and strengthen them in their struggle. By looking backward in the past, as well as looking forward into the future, I venture to say that the United States of America has been and is to be the home base of democracy in the world.

The development of democracy in China.-- Turning now to the development of democracy in China. One would be surprised to hear that in Chinese history a temporary "Republic" was actually set up in the year 841 B.C., when Li Wang, an Emperor of the Chou Dynasty, was expelled from the throne by the people, and two excellent political leaders, Chou Kung and Chiu Kung, were entrusted with taking charge of the central government through their effective cooperation. Another thing worth to be noticed is that centuries ago, Mencius (372-288 B.C.) had enunciated clearly the principle: "The people are of great value and sovereign of slight value," and he would justify rebellion against hopeless corrupt rulers. However, the modern form of democracy in China did not occur until Christianity and its influence were introduced into China. Of course we know that the Chinese Revolution in 1911, and the downfall of the Ching Dynasty and the establishment of the Republic in the following year, laid a foundation of the modern democracy in China. But when we think of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the Founder of the Chinese Republic, who was brought up

and taught western democratic ideals in Hawaii, and think of the revolutionary forerunners, most of them were educated in Christian schools; and also think of the work that has been done by missionaries through all Christian agencies, such as churches, schools, hospitals, associations, etc., which helped a great deal in the general enlightenment of the people, we can hardly fail to see the constructive relation between Christianity and Chinese democracy. Today China under the leadership of her Christian governors, including Madame and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and other important officials, is able to show a democratic spirit in spite of the fact that, on one hand, Kuomingtang becomes the controlling party and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek is entrusted with the greatest political and military authority, and on the other hand, the nation is facing a most serious emergency created by the Japanese military invasion. This may be judged by the following facts:

(1) The recognition of political parties by the Central Government and the formation of a "United Front". As all kinds of Western "isms" and theories were introduced into China during the last fifteen years, the national consciousness and sense of responsibility on the part of the people were so highly stimulated and effectively strengthened that they began to organize various political parties, among which the Communist and the National Socialist are the two

outstanding. It is a fact known to the world that the hostility between Kuomingtang (People's Party) and the Communists has lasted more than ten years. But since the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese war which was really begun on September 18, 1931, the rapprochement between these two parties was made possible and finally they compromised in forming an "United Front" to fight for national independence and liberation. At the same time, the party of the National Socialists which is comparatively new and different from that of the German, as declared by Chang Chuen-mai, its founder, was formally recognized by the Central Government, which is still under the control of Kuomingtang. Apparently this points to the tendency or sign of the Chinese political system which will not again drift into a one-party dictatorship. In fact, the present toleration or compromise among different political parties will possibly produce a type of democracy which best suits the Chinese situation.

(2) The establishment of the People's Political Council. Although the People's Political Council is initiated by the political leaders of the Central Government, it is organized with the purpose of securing opinions and help from the people in accomplishing the great task of "resisting the invasion and building the nation." It consists of representatives of all classes numbering over two hundred men and women. It had its first session soon after

the beginning of the war and had its second session recently. This may be reasonably regarded as a sign of the first step in the return of the government to the people of China by the Kuomingtang.

(3) The start and promotion of the New Life Movement. This movement speaks for itself by the name, "New Life". It is also one of the organized efforts of the Centra Government and its origin is credited to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. It is founded on the four ancient virtues of Chinese people taught by Confucianism, namely:

"Li" means regulated attitude;
"I" means right conduct;
"Lien" means clear discrimination;
"Chih" means true self-consciousness.

In fact, it is a program for national spiritual, and physical regeneration. What I want to call to our attention is the cooperation between the Christian Church and State in this movement. The churches in China have lent to the Government their best men in promoting this New Life movement. An outstanding example of effective cooperation of church and government is in the rural welfare center in Kiangsi Province. This makes Madam Chiange Kai-shek speak openly in an address before the Eleventh Biennial Conference of the National Christian Council 1937: "I wish on behalf of the Generalissimo and myself to invite a still closer co-operation through the activities of the New Life Movement."[1]

---

[1] Mme Chiang Kai-shek, address (condensed) in World Christianity, Vol. I, No. 3, Third Quarter, 1937.

The importance and significance of this movement will be clearly seen when we look upon it as a social revolution going on side by side with political revolution. It is, indeed, one of the creative working factors of the Chinese democracy.

CHAPTER III

MODERN ATTACK ON DEMOCRACY AND THREATS TO CHRISTIANITY

When we compare the meaning of democracy with the essentials of Christianity and trace their relationship in history, as we have done in the preceding chapters, we will agree with Dr. Edwin E. Aubrey when he says, "It is only fair to recognize that in the pleas of ancient Hebrew prophets for social justice, in the communal life of early Christian communities, in the fellowship of many medieval monastic orders, and in the characteristic Protestant stress upon the right of private judgment, modern democracy has found its roots."[1] Indeed, Christianity may be regarded as the nurse, if not the mother, of democracy. Though Christianity cannot be identified with democracy, they share, more or less, a common destiny. To attack either one of them means to threaten the other. The modern attack on democracy and threats to Christianity are created by the dictatorship of totalitarian states, by capitalism and plutocracy, and by the secularization of Christianity. Let us discuss these three points respectively.

Dictatorship of totalitarian states.--

1. Fascist Italy. The rise of Fascism in Italy has

---

[1] Dr. E. E. Aubrey, "Religion and the Democratic Dream" The Christian Century, LVII, No. 36, September, 1940.

gone through a "cause and effect" process. It is not something which happened accidentally. All the factors, such as the suffering of the agrarian class from heavy taxation, the fighting against wage reduction by the trade unions, the serious conflict growing between the classes, the fear of Communism, and the disappointment of the nationalists regarding the peace of Versailles and the rewards of their joining the Allied Powers, have paved the way for the Fascist who tries to bring about a vigorous national unity by forcible action. The Fascist party grew so rapidly that from May 1920 to October 1922 when the March on Rome took place, the number of their membership was increased from thirty thousand to over three hundred thousand. After Benito Mussolini, the founder of Fascism, who has been regarded as the incarnator of the Eternal Italy, was called to Rome by the King on October 28, 1922, the government and its power were placed in the hands of the Fascists. Benito Mussolini is the son of a village blacksmith of internationalist revolutionary and anti-religious opinions. He himself used to be an organizer of working-class movements and a revolutionary journalist. By the effective means of force of arms, espionage and propaganda, he is able to play the role of Divine Emperor of ancient Rome. The way Fascism denies democracy and gives no place to Christianity may be seen by observing the following points extracted from Mussolini's own words:[1]

---

[1] Benito Mussolini, Doctrine of Fascism (Firenze, 1935)

a) For Fascism the State is absolute, individuals and groups relative.

b) The State guarantees the internal and external safety of the country, but it also safeguards and transmits the spirit of the people, elaborated down the ages in its language, its customs, its faith. The State is not only the present, it is also the past and above all the future.[1]

c) The State educates the citizens to civism, makes them aware of their mission, urges them to unity.[2]

d) It (Fascism) aims at refashioning not only the forms of life but their content -- man, his character, and his faith. To achieve this purpose it enforces discipline and uses authority, entering into the soul and ruling with undisputed sway. Therefore it has chosen as its emblem the Lictor's rods, the symbol of unity, strength and justice.[3]

e) The Fascist conception of the State is all embracing; outside of it no human or spiritual values can exist, much less have value.[4]

f) Fascism aims its gun at the whole block of democratic ideologies, and rejects both their premises and their practical applications and implements . . . . . It asserts the irremediable and fertile and beneficient inequality of men who cannot be levelled by any such mechanical and extrinsic device as universal suffrage.[5]

g) All doctrines which postulate peace at all costs are incompatible with Fascism. Equally foreign to the spirit of Fascism are all internationalistic or League superstructures. Fascism carries this anti-pacifist attitude into the life of the individual.[6]

2. Nazi Germany. In Germany, Nazism or National Socialism came into existence and developed under the terrific stress and strain of the post-war period. The post-war inflation with its subsequent destruction of the German economic system, and the bitter humiliation of defeat, made

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 38-39. [2] Ibid., pp. 38-39. [3] Ibid., pp.17-18
[4] Ibid., pp. 28-30. [5] Ibid., p.14. [6] Ibid., pp. 26-27.

Germany suffer a financial and psychological breakdown. However, as this national crisis demanded unity of action, it gave the Nazis a good opportunity to supply this urgent need. The underlying philosophy and policy of Nazism is the same as that of Fascism. But Adolf Hitler perfected Mussolini's organizational pattern and put behind it a racial cult that has the fervor of religion. He believes that the Germanic, Nordic, or Aryan race is either the most noble or the only creative race. He has the grandiose and fanatical dram of building up from this superior race a people to dominate Europe and perhaps the whole world. Among the twenty-five points of the Nazi social program, the following one are noteworthy:[1]

a) Organization by the State of all educational and cultural work with emphasis on the science of citizenship.

b) Drastic control of the Press.

c) Freedom for religious creeds in so far as they teach in harmony with the Germanic State.

d) The union of all Germans in a Pan-German State.

e) Abrogation of the treaties of Versailles and St. Germain.

f) Citizenship in the German State to be limited to those of German blood.

g) Prohibition of immigration of non-Germans.

Besides, Dr. J. A. Leighton in his Social Philosophies

---

[1]Joseph A. Leighton, Social Philosophies in Conflict, p.

in Conflict gives us an interesting illustration of the official creed of the Hitler youth, which he calls "Teutonic Islamism":[1]

> All that I am I owe to my ancestors. I am the carrier of the heritage of my ancestors, both physically and spiritually ..... We believe in ourselves as the fated link in the eternal chain of generations, for I am what I am through my ancestors and my decendants will be thus also. We believe in God as the eternal manifestation of Force and Life, on the earth and in the universe ..... The idea of God is natural for the Germanic man ..... Our concept of God and Eternity has nothing in common with the tenets of any confession or any religious philosophy. We believe in the eternity of the German nation and in eternal Germany, because we believe in the eternity of Force and Life. We believe in the correctness of the National Socialist concept of life. We believe in the righteousness of our goals. We believe in Adolf Hitler, our great leader.

Thus the National Socialist Youth who are trained this way would naturally "trample under foot all civil and spiritual freedom, despite the spirit of reason and objective science as well as Christian love, worship only the unprincipled impulse for power; reject the humanitarian as well as the democratic concepts; proclaim themselves the leaders and rulers of the God-chosen Nordic race."[2]

3. Pseudo-Fascist Japan. The pseudo-Fascist movement in Japan has its roots in the feudal system under which the monarch and religious organization are centered in the Emperor who is believed to be the true decendant of the Heaven Shining Goddess. After the World War the Fascist movement was led by the junior officers of the army recruited

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 46-47. [2] Ibid., p. 47.

from the lower middle-classes. It is more or less like the Nazi movement in Germany, since it contains the elements of: (a) a semi-religious nationalism; (b) glorification of the past and insistence upon the mission of a chosen race; (c) faith in the military virtues and in war; and (d) the desire for the social rise of the lower middle classes and the peasantry, as pointed out by Professor Hans Kohn.[1] However, it was through cooperation with Germany and Italy, and through signing the Anti-Comitern Pact, that Japan approached full-fledged Fascism. It is reasonable for Dr. Leighton to point out that "Japan is a thoroughly totalitarian state, in which the absolute powers of the elder statesmen and the militaristic elite are strongly buttressed by a long-standing ethos which subordinates the individual completely to the group spirit, all the way from the family to the Emperor . . . . . With its facile adoption of Western individualism and mechanicalism, directed by a feudalistic militarism, Japan at present is one of the greatest menaces to the survival and progress of social democracy."[2] This is substantiated by her undeclared war against China, her control over all the religious organizations and movements, and her south-sea invasion policy and the so-called "New Order of Asia".

---

[1]Hans Kohn, Revolutions and Dictatorships, p. 190

[2]Leighton, op. cit., p. 484.

4. Communist Russia. Theoretically speaking, Soviet Russia, the only great communist nation in the world, should not be treated as one of the totalitarian states. The leaders of Soviet Russia hold that Russia is now still in the stage of Socialism which is making an effective transition from Capitalism to Communism, and, they also believe that through Communism a classless society will come into being where all will cooperate freely and the State will wither away. However, facts are always truer and stronger than arguments. When we think of the following facts, we cannot help but see features of the Russia Communism which are in common with the totalitarian states:

(a) One-party and one class dictatorship. Joseph Stalin has practically said, in his speech on the occasion of the Soviet Congress to adopt the new Constitution (November 25, 1936), "Yes, the dictatorship of the working class will remain . . . . . As regards political parties, several parties can exist when there are antagonistic classes . . . . . In the U.S.S.R. there is no soil for several parties. There is soil for only one party, which can only be the Communist party.[1] So far as the present situation is concerned, Russian Communism is a dictatorship of the class-conscious minority of the proletariat.

(b) No freedom of thought and no development and propagation of heretical or different systems of thought or faith

---

[1] Ibid., p. 100.

is allowed to individual or to the national groups. This, according to Professor Hans Kohn, is probably due to the fact that Communism is concerned entirely with the future, to which it sacrifices not only the past, but even the present. "Both types of dictatorship (Fascism and Communism) are ruthless and without regard for the happiness and freedom of the present individual."[1]

(c) The signing of the Russo-German Pact in 1939 and the Russo-Japanese Pact in April 14, 1941 have impressed people with the idea that the Russian Communism is simply the twin of Fascism.

Furthermore, when we talk about Communism in Russia, we have to think of the social philosophy of Karl Marx, as adapted by Nicholas Lenin. According to Dr. H. G. Wood,[2] the leading ideas of Marx's Historical Materialism, are: (1) the insistence on the basic importance for human society, for its organization and development of the technique of production; (2) the emphasis on class-struggle as the main theme of history; (3) the claim that ideologies (legal and political systems and even philosophies and scientific theories) are all in the last resort determined by the economic factor; and (4) the belief in the dialectical movement in history. It is the last three points which assert that the dictatorship of the proletariat in the class struggle is the inevitable and the only way to end the class war;

---

[1] Kohn, op. cit., p. 193

[2] H. G. Wood, Christianity and Communism, pp. 34-40.

conceives the higher life of man as only a projection from his economic life; and sees only the mechanical process in human history. It is these same points which indicate that Communism is deterministic, materialistic and anti-religious.

Capitalism and plutocracy.-- The term "plutocracy" litterally means rule by either "wealth" or "the wealthy". But the latter seems more adequate as it remin s us of the modern capitalist states in which groups of wealthy men are organized, or loosely united to influence industry, politics and puolic opinion. It functions not only in a monarchy, an aristocracy, an oligarchy, but also in a democracy, since it has allied itself with Capitalism, whose devsopment has taken place along with the development of democracy. All of us know that it was the industrial revolution, which was the result of the invention and utilization of machines, that gave rise to modern Capitalism; and it is this Capitalism, which aims at the free and unfettered pursuit of individual happiness, which makes possible the concentration of economic power. In commenting upon plutocracy, Dr. Walter E. Weyl provides us with three clear points:[1]

(1) Its ideal is the conquest of the world's market.

(2) Its creed is freedom of large industry from political interference.

(3) Its weapon is monopoly and large scale production.

---

[1] Walter E. Weyl, The New Democracy, (MacMillan 1913) 94.

Today the economic groups who control corporations and master the industrial world are able to protect their particular interests by shaping the policy of political parties, controlling organs of public opinion, forestalling the rise of competitors and, when necessary, buying legislation and influencing the judiciary and the administrative branches of government. This is the reason why "Woodrow Wilson maintained, at one time, that united capitalists and industrialists are the masters of the American state; while Robert de Jouvenel in a celebrated essay proclaimed France a 'republic of predatory comrades.'"[1]

Plutocracy, which is built upon the basis of Capitalism becomes an inward menace to modern democracy on account of the following facts:

(1) It exploits science and technology.

(2) It creates a climate in which people can never freely give their opinions or carry out their convictions.

(3) It makes the electorate, the people, "into a plurality of groups" and takes away the "homogeneous unity and concomitant flexibility of the electorate which the doctrine of the will of the people tacitly or explicity had assumed to exist."[2]

(4) It shares the responsibility of creating social disturbances, such as the industrial exploitation, unemploy-

---

[1] C. J. Friedrich, "Plutocracy" Encyclopaedia of the Political Sciences.

[2] Ibid.

ment, strikes, economic depressions and violent movements.

(5) It gradually paves the way for either Fascism, which seeks State control of everything, or Communism, which practises dictatorship of the proletariat.

(6) It permits inequality which means poverty and insecurity and lack of opportunity for large sections of people on one hand, and life of waste and luxury for the privileged section of society on the other.

(7) It is responsible for the "starvation in the midst of plenty".

Secularization of Christianity.-- Christianity, though spiritual in nature, may be secularized through the life of the conventional Church and nominal Christians, like democracy, which is essentially a principle or an ideal, may be corrupted through the forms of government and other social systems. The secularization of Christianity is both the effect and the cause of the modern attack on democracy and threats to Christianity. It is an effect because Christianity has had to make an adjustment to the prevailing secular civilization which is hostile to it. This secularism in the modern world is so overwhelming and invasive that Christianity is forced to make compromises. The life of the Church and Christians are then effected and secularized to a certain extent. It is also a cause, for when Christianity accepted and adopted the secular way of life it could no longer be really Christian, and it undermines,

instead of nourishing democracy. What is secularism or secular civilization? How did it come into being? In what way and to what extent has Christianity been secularized? Let us give a brief discussion to each of these questions.

"Secularism", accordingly to Dr. J. C. Bennett,[1] has a two-fold meaning: (a) the highest objects of devotion are human ideals and human causes which emerge in the social process; (b) the view regards man as the product of a blind cosmic process (or processes). It is obvious that this secular way of life and interpretation of nature of things leaves no room for God or spiritual reality. People, Christians or non-Christians, who have accepted this secularism have become detached from organized religion (including Christianity), have found their religious fervor in their social passion, and have the conviction that man can lead the good life without believing in God. By a deeper study and analysis, we will see that this prevailing secularism or secular civilization has its roots in naturalistic philosophy, behaviorist psychology, and humanistic materialism, and owes its development to the industrial revolution, the machine age, the economic order and other social changes.

Here is a list of opinions which are generally held which indicate the nature and extent of the secularization of Christianity:

---

[1]John C. Bennett, Christianity and Our World, pp. 1-2

(1) In many cases the Christian Church is in bondage to capitalism, and in alliance with the upper middle class -- the bourgeois group.

(2) There is a dangerous tendency for the Christian Church to become merely an agency for propaganda rather than a free fellowship for spiritual exploration.

(3) Humanism, Liberalism, Modernism, science and technology have led the Church to compromise with anthropocentricism and human self-sufficiency.

(4) "The confusion of denominations and sectarianism has played havoc in the work of spiritual leadership . . . . . Instead of massing the religious forces for the spiritualization of these communities, the rival churches have divided the neighbourhood into little party groups, often dominated by petty aims."[1]

(5) The secularization of Christianity has created a type of Christians who are either "trying to find God who moves the world and rules the world, by retreating from God's world", or shifting responsibility by "crying for the Great Personality, the Mystic Genius, the Heaven-sent Messiah who will do for us what we cannot do for ourselves individually or collectively." [2]

The points mentioned above give us a picture of the "darker side" of Christianity as it is threatened by secularism. No wonder it is held that the greatest rival of Christ-

---

[1]Rufus M. Jones, "Secular Civilization and the Christian Task, in the Report of Jerusalem Meeting, I.M.C. 1928.

[2]Vlastos, Op. cit., pp. 32-33

ianity in the world today is this prevailing and spreading secular civilization. However, when we look at the 'brighter side" of Christianity of our time, we will find that there are Christian individuals, organizations and movements fighting any secularized religion which enjoys self-sufficiency, glorifies ego-centricity, feeds on hate and reverts to magic. Indeed, our best Christian thinkers among theologians, philosophers, psychologists and educators are coming more and more to see the need of joining forces and working much more in concert to meet the secularist position. This will, we trust, make the picture of future Christianity more hopeful.

CHAPTER IV

RECONSTRUCTION OF "DEMOCRATIC CHRISTIANITY" AND "CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY"

The roots of democracy depend a great deal on Christian premises, and historical Christianity has found much fuller expression in democratic societies. But because of the development of plutocracy in the economic order, the spread of a secular civilization rooted in a naturalistic, humanistic and materialistic thought-world, and the rise of the new totalitarian states, Christianity is weakened even to be non-democratic itself, and democracy is led to be non-Christian, in spite of their close historical relations.

The rivalry between secularism and Christianity, and the disharmony between Christianity and democracy becomes so serious that modern Christians, leaders and laymen, are forced to re-evaluate both Christianity and democracy and re-examine their relations. Today various tendencies and signs in the Christian thinking and movements are pointing to the reconstruction of "democratic Christianity" and "Christian democracy". A general survey of some of the outstanding world Christian conferences and their findings, and of the opinions expressed by distinguished contemporary Christian thinkers will assure us of this belief and hope.

Practical suggestions from some outstanding world Christian conferences.-- The significance of all the great world Christian conferences lies in the "ecumenical movement" which aims at the creation and realization of a world community of Christian people, transcending differences of nationality and denomination. The practical suggestions would be seen, of course, in the findings and recommendations centered around the message of the Church in relation to the vital challenges of the life of the time.

The Universal Christian Council on Life and Work held at Stockholm in 1925, brought the Protestant churches of America, England, the Continent and the Eastern Orthodox faith into a practical fellowship. The World Conference on Faith and Order held at Lausanne in 1927 achieved its purpose of discussing frankly the problem of the divisions of the Church with respect to faith, doctrine, sacraments and orders and led to a common conviction of a universal Church. In the year 1937, we have two noteworthy conferences: one at Edinburgh in succession to that of Lausanne, the other at Oxford in succession to that of Stockholm. Through the encouragement received in these conferences, the Christian Church in every part of the world acquired a growing consciousness of its own nature as an ecumenical society.

Another branch of world Christian movement that is at work on the problem of Church union is the International

Missionary Council which was the child of the World Missionary Conference held at Edinburgh in 1910. This International Missionary Council has proved to be significant in the realm of cooperative achievement. It held two important world meetings; one at Jerusalem in 1928, the other at Madras, India in 1938. The former laid emphasis upon the assertion of "The Christian Message"; the latter concentrated on "The World Mission of the Church" with special consideration of "the Church itself, the faith by which it lives, the nature of its witness, the conditions of its life and extension, the relation it must hold to its environment, and the increase of co-operation and unity within it."[1]

In the examination of the findings and recommendations of these world Christian conferences, I shall confine myself to two of them, namely, the Oxford Conference and the Madras Conference.

1. The Oxford Conference. The Conference was held at Oxford from July 12th to 16th, 1937. The general subject of the Conference was "Church, Community and State . Its essential theme, as pointed out by Dr. J. H. Oldham in his introduction to the official report of the conference, was, "the life-and-death struggle between Christian Faith and the secular and pagan tendencies of our time." So far as the reports and findings are concerned, this Conference

---

[1] The World Mission of the Church (Findings and recommendations of the International Missionary Council) p. 7.

helps us to see and understand the right relation between Christianity and democracy through its declaration regarding the following points:

a) The distinctive functions of Church and State.[1]

> The church as the trustee of God's redeeming gospel and the state as the guarantor of order, justice, and civil liberty have distinct functions in regard to society. The church's concern is to witness to men of the realities which outlast change because they are founded on the eternal will of God. The concern of the state is provide men with justice, order and security in a world of sin and change. As it is the aim of the church to create a community founded on divine love, it cannot do its work by coercion, nor must it compromise the standards embodied in God's commandments by surrender to the necessities of the day. The state, on the other hand, has the duty of maintaining public order, and therefore must use coercion and accept the limits of the praticable . . . . the Christian must always, whether as a member of the church or as a citizen, obey the will of God.

b) Duties of the Church to the State.[2]

> These duties are that of praying for the state, its people and its governments; that of loyalty and obedience to the state, disobedience becoming a duty only if obedience would be clearly contrary to the command of God; that of cooperation with the state in promoting the welfare of the citizens and of lending moral support to the state when it upholds the standards of justice set forth in the Word of God; that of criticism of the state when it departs from those standards; that of holding before men in all their legislation and administration those principles which make for the upholding of the dignity of man who is made in the image of God; that of permeating the public life with the spirit of Christ and of training up men and women who as Christians can contribute to this end.
>
> In the interpretation of these duties it is important to keep constantly in mind that as the church in its own sphere is a universal society, so to Christian faith the individual state is not itself the ultimate political unit, but a member of a family of nations with

---

[1]The Oxford Conference (Official Report) pp. 69-70.

[2]Ibid., pp. 70-71.

international relations and duties which it is the responsibility not only of the individual Christians but also of the churches to affirm and to promote.[1]

c) The Christian View of Freedom and Authority.

The point at which the church comes into immediate conflict with the totalitarian tendencies of the state is where these tendencies are inspired by a myth and a religious or pseudo-religious claim on the unconditional devotion of men -- in other words, where these tendencies attempted to be a substitute for the church . . . . . It is indispensable that the church clarify its mind in respect to the grounds on which it regards human freedom in general even over against the state as a special concern of its own, and in regard to the measures which it ought to take to conserve this freedom . . . . .The church as the messenger of the gospel and as the community in which freedom in God is a living reality represents the ultimate boundary against totalitarian tendences of every kind . . . . . For the church demands freedom to proclaim the gospel to all mankind and in all spheres of life, not for its own sake but because it has received this commission from God, who is also the Lord of the state . . . . . The freedom which the church must claim includes also its service of love to those who are in need, to the sick, and to the oppressed. It must include further the opportunity of cooperation through its members in the transformation of the social order in the light of the divine will.

d) The basis of the Christian concern for the economic order.[2]

The relative and departmental standard for all the social arrangements and institutions, all the economic structures and political systems, by which the life of man is ordered is the principle of justice . . . . . Justice does not demand that the self sacrifice itself completely for the neighbor's good, but seeks to define and to maintain the good which each member of the community may rightfully claim in the harmony of the whole . . . . . Forms of production and methods of cooperation may serve the cause of human brotherhood by serving and extending the principle of love beyond the sphere of purely personal relations. The commandment of love therefore always presents possibilities for individuals be-

---

[1] Ibid., pp.246-249.

[2] Ibid., pp. 75-79.

yond the requirements of economic and social institutions . . . . . In attempting to deal with political and economic problems, the Christian must therefore be specially on his guard against two errors. The one is to regard the realities of social justice incorporated in given systems and orders as so inferior to the law of lowe th t the latter cannot be a principle of discrimination among them but only a principle of indiscriminate judgment upon them all . . . . . The other error is to identify some particular social system with the will of God or to equate it with the Kingdom of God.

e) The ecumenical church and the international order.[1]

It is important to bear in mind in this connection the fundamental distinction between "ecumenical" and "international". The term "international" necessarily accepts the division of mankind into separate nations as a natural if not a final state of affairs. The term "ecumenical" refers to the expression within history of the given unity of the church . . . . . This fact of the ecumenical character of the church carries with it the important consequence that the church brings to the task of achieving a better international order an insight which is not to be derived from ordinary political sources . . . . . True ecumenicaty therefore must be the goal of all our efforts . . . . . Churches must be not simply tolerant one toward another but concerned about unity one with the other . . . . . A true conception of international order requires a recognition of the fact that the state, whether it admits it or not, is not autonomous but is under the ultimate governance of God.

2. The Madras Conference. The Conference was held at Tambrarm near Madras from December 12th to 29th, 1938. It was an "ecumenical" gathering of 471 delegates from 69 nations and from many races of the earth. As it took place one year before the outbreak of this European war, the Conference was deeply conscious of the confusion of the international situation and of the shadow of fear of war. It

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 152-155

keenly felt the tension between church and state. It recognized the conflict between the existing economic order and the Christian ideals. It saw both democracy and Christianity attacked and menaced. It visualized the picture of the world darkened by social injustice, racial hatred and pagan secularism. However, through the discussions and the sharing of opinions and experiences, the Conference was able to set forth practical suggestions which will be a great help for meeting the challenge of our time. I should like to quote a few points from its findings and recommendations:

a) The Church in its impact on Society.[1]

> The Church must, as the fellowship of Christ, speak, act, work and pray for a Christian society, make its influence felt beyond its own walls and beyond its own community: (1) It must subject the institutions of government and of society and the practices of groups or nations to the strong light of Christ's spirit. It must judge, condemn and fearlessly declare the implications of the Gospel when the existing order is contrary to the Will of God for His children . . . . . (2) Since the strongest and most courageous action is possible in sympathetic fellowship, the Church should buttress its members when they find themselves in conflict with the established order because of unselfish efforts to reconstruct it in the light of the teaching and spirit of Jesus, while helping them always to make their witness in the spirit of love . . . . . (3) At the same time, the Church should encourage and promote small groups within the fellowship organized for specific types of social action, even when these groups work through legislative and political machinery; (4) While the Church should not identify itself with a particular political party it should stimulate its members to make a right use of political machinery for the welfare of those who suffer from oppression or exploitation . . . . . Political action by churches may be as Christian as any other type of

---

[1] The World Mission of the Church (Findings and recommendations of the International Missionary Council) pp. 110-111.

Christian social action, but it is the duty of the Church to keep the means as well as the ends of such action entirely consistent with the highest Christian ideals.

b) Three aims of the Church in relation to the State.[1]

Its first and immediate aim should be to secure by Christian methods relief from the disabilities to which it is subjected. . . . . The second and more far-reaching aim of the Church should be to ascertain the underlying causes which have led the State to impose restrictions on religious freedom, and, as far as lies in its power, to remove them . . . . the Church's third and continuous aim, namely in all its relations with government, and in all its decisions, to bear witness to its complete, ultimate loyalty to God, and to show forth the spirit of Christ even if it involves suffereing or martyrdom.

c) The Missionary Enterprise and the International Order.[2]

In the missionary enterprise the Christian movement makes an indispensable contribution to the international order . . . . . The missionary movement springs from a sense of indebtedness to God who has shared His very best with us in Christ, and an eager desire to share any good thing that we may have, and most of all the Gospel itself, with men of every land and nation. Here international and inter-racial contact may reach its highest level . . . . . In view of the present international situation the value of the international character of the missionary movement is more than usually apparent . . . . . Missionary societies should demonstrate the ecumenical character of the missionary enterprise by seriously considering the appointment of other nationals than their own as missionaries . . . . . The problem of the Church and the international order is rightly approached in the spirit and fellowship of the ecumenical Church.

d) Cooperation and Unity.[3]

We recommend: (1) that studies be undertaken with a view to securing cooperation in church discipline . . . .

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 126-127.

[2] Ibid., pp. 119-121.

[3] The World Mission of the Church, p. 181

(2) that the organization of co-operative institutions be reviewed in the light of the principle that the indigenous church should have an influential share in the control and direction of policy, and in the relation of institution to the whole Christian enterprise; (3) that a deliberate and sustained effort be made by the International Missionary Council and by the National Christian Councils to win the active co-operation of Christian groups that are at present outside our fellowship; (4) that National Christian Councils be urged to initiate co-operative planning for the whole Christian enterprise in their respective fields, and that mission boards and churches on the field should consult with the National Christian Councils in such matters; (5) that in view of the evident leading of God and the supreme urgency of the call for organic union on the part of the younger churches, the older churches take this to heart with the utmost seriousness, in the fields of prayer, thought and action.

The constructive criticisms, positive attitudes, inspiring faith and practical recommendations expressed in, and set forth by, both the Oxford Conference and the Madras Conference have provided a searchlight and guiding principle for the Christian Church which stands for and is devoted to truth, justice, freedom and the Christian democratic way of life. In Norway today, seven Lutheran bishops have formed a united front in the struggle for the freedom of their churches from the regime of Nazi Tyranny, and were brave enough to condemn three types of injustice and lawlessness of which the government was guilty. We may also regard the Malvern Conference held at Malvern College, Worcestershire, England, January 7 to 10, 1941, as the reflection of the influence of the Oxford and Madras Conferences. In the Malvern Conference, 23 bishops, 14 deans, 21 canons, 90 clergymen and 70 laymen gathered together "to discuss from the Anglican viewpoint ways and means of finding a new order of society--a new integration of religion, morals,

politics and economics." Besides adopting the 13 propositions presented by the Archbishop of York, the Conference adopted also the amendment introduced by Sir Richard Acland, which denounces the private ownership of the "great resources of our community" as a "stumbling block" to men who want to live Christian lives, and urged Christians "to proclaim the need for seeking some form of society in which this stumbling block will be removed."[1] In short, the Oxford, Madras, and other "ecumenical" Christian conferences are actually working factors toward the reconstruction of "democratic Christianity" and "Christian democracy."

Constructive opinions expressed by the distinguished contemporary Christian thinkers.-- It is said that the intelligentsia or the learned class is the 'mind" of society. The influence of scholars, philosophers, scientists, and theologians, upon social systems is as significant as that of the mind on body. What is the current Christian thinking concerning the relation between Christianity and democracy? What will be the contribution of the Christian Church toward the reconstruction of democratic Christianity and Christian democracy? In order to get a clue to these questions we have to pay more attention to the opinions of our contemporary Christian thinkers who are the "mind" of the great Christian society. To this end, I am going to introduce here the points of view of some of the outstanding theologians of our time.

---

1. The full text of the Malvern Conference is published in The Christian Century, Vol.LVIII, No.8, Feb.19, 1941, under the title, "The Church and a New World Order."

1. Karl Barth. Karl Barth appears as a most influential figure among Christian theologians of our time. It is true that nobody seems to be able to talk theology these days without mentioning him. His "theology of crisis" is the outcome of his spiritual insight gained and developed through his life experience. He was born in Switzerland and trained in Germany. He used to be an optimistic Christian socialist as well as a liberal Protestant minister. It was the tragedy of the World War and pagan secularism that led to Nazism in Germany that brought to him disillusionment as to the power of social idealism and a sense of the futility of human exhortation. He has a clear idea about Church and the State. He takes a definite and positive attitude toward them. He would never make any compromise to the secular aim of the State at the expense of freedom of the church. For him the service of the Church in the world is a witnessing to God's prophecy, priesthood and Kingdom. It should never be just one of the instruments of power of society or of the ruling class of the society. Although "the Church cannot wield the sword; the Church cannot wage crusades. But the Church in all her members forms a solidarity with the State which, as a just State, as a State not yet lost to tyranny or anarchy, actively resists the radical dissolution of the just State."[1] At times, the

---

1. Karl Barth, The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day, P. 78.

the Church may be silent with her Yes and No to many contemporary questions. "But," says Barth,"with all this, it is not denied, but rather asserted that in the actualization of her confession, the Church has to call white white and black black when the hour strikes and the occasion is here to do this in the act of witnessing to Jesus Christ."[1] In The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day, he points out that the "character of National Socialism as a political experiment, is a dictatorship which is 'totalitarian' and 'radical', which not only surrounds and determines mankind and men in utter totality, in body and soul, but abolishes their human nature, and does not limit human freedom, but annihilates it." He is sure that "in the face of National Socialism there is no longer neutrality for the Church today, no longer delay with her Yes or No," and regrets that the majority of the Confessional Church in Germany still thinks there can be. He recognizes the State's significance as service of God. But this significance can be clear in one place and obscure in another, as he says:

> The significance of the political order as the service of God become clear where the State provides and preserves freedom for the Church. The Church requires nothing more and declines anything further. But she does require full freedom to pursue her task, which is a different one from that of the State. Forgiveness of sin is something different from justice. And eternal life is not the same as peace and freedom. The Church requires scope to deliver her own message about forgiveness of sin and eternal life in the name of her Lord. The significance of the political order as the service of God is obscured where the State refuses the Church this scope

---

1. The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day, pp. 18-19.

> or sets limits to it. It is obscured where the State demands of the Church that she subject and adapt herself to the aims of the State. It is obscured when the State furthers the false church in opposition to the true. It is obscure where the State, perhaps by making its own aims absolute, as in Germany today, becomes itself a church, a church which will without doubt be a false one and the most intolerant of all churches.[1]

2. Emil Brunner. Being a theologian as well as a teacher of Christian ethics, Dr. Emil Brunner, who was born in Switzerland, and works as a professor in Zurich, like other sensitive thinkers of the time, cannot but feel that both freedom and democracy have been rudely shaken. This is due to, on one hand, "the triumph of the principle of autonomy, the severance of the order of the State from all connection with the eternal world, and on the other hand, the dominance of the power of economic interests over the authority of the State."[2] Is it only an "either-or" choice for the modern State to take between democracy and dictatorship? Is there going to be a third alternative? What is the real nature and purpose of the State? What should be the Christian attitude toward the relation between Church and State? We will find some answers to these burning questions in Dr. Brunner's The Divine Imperative.

In the discussion of the nature of the State, Dr. Brunner reminds us, first of all, to distinguish between the State and the nation. The State is not the nation and the nation is not the State. The State is simply the form or the

---

1. The Knowledge of God and the Service of God according to the Teaching of the Reformation, p. 226.
2. E. Brunner, The Divine Imperative, 440-441.

order of the people which is to be understood in terms of a) neighborhood; b) blood relationship; c) language; d) culture and e) a common destiny. Thus it is the people that gives the nation its content and meaning. The people is the nation. The purpose of the State is the good of the people. Because of this, the State has to pay respect to other forms of community, such as those of the family, the economic order and the culture. "All these divine orders of creation", says Dr. Brunner, "preceded the State, and have a relative independent aim, which is not primarily bound to the State."[1] In all these, the State can be no more than supplementary. However, the modern State has, in fact, incorporated those other spheres in order to increase its own power. It has set itself up as the "Transcendent", as the absolute force and tried to bring everything under its control.

In analyzing the purpose of the State, Dr. Brunner points out that the State exists for a two-fold purpose, namely, the "technical objective purpose" and the "personal purpose of community." To him this two-fold purpose is the guiding principle for determining the form of government. He thinks that neither complete autocracy nor unqualified democracy can be the right form of government, when taking this two-fold purpose of the State into consideration, as he explains:[2]

> The "concrete purpose": the attainment of the highest possible good of the State, as far as the people is concerned, requires either an autocracy or an oligarchy with extensive powers; for the "concrete purpose" can only be known and realized by experts. On the other hand, the purpose of achieving the fullest possible unity

1. Ibid., p. 458.
2. Ibid., pp. 466-467.

> of the people requires that all should take the greatest possible share of responsibility for the State. The comparatively best form for the State--taking circumstances into account--must be sought in creating a compromise between two points of view.

In order to make clear Dr. Brunner's thought concerning political theory and the desirable form of government, I quote some more of his words:[1]

> Anarchy must be prevented by the exercise of authority, tyranny must be checked by democracy. The supporters of modern Fascism forget the good of the State is too dearly bought at the expense of the deprivation of the members of the State of their rights. The champion of democracy forgets that, as a rule, the people as a whole is not a very competent guardian of the common weal, especially if the "common weal" includes the higher kind of leadership, the power which preserves order. Unqualified autocracy nearly always degenerates into tyranny; unqualified democracy nearly always degenerates into mob-rule and latent anarchy. "Democratism," that is, the belief that political salvation depends solely on democracy, arises out of an optimistic view of the goodness of human nature, akin to the spirit of the Enlightenment, and also from an abstract idea of community, which cannot tolerate any inequality, whereas real community is based upon inequality. The modern cry for the "Leader," and for the "ruler with the strong hand," however, springs from a weary longing for repose and for release from responsibility.

Regarding the attitude of the Christian towards the State and its crisis, Dr. Brunner gives us suggestions which may be grouped into the following six points:

a) Theologians should reflect upon questions relating to the State, for the Church, the community of believers, cannot understand itself and its task in the world without having its own view of the meaning and the function of the State.[2]

---

1. Ibid., p. 467.
2. Ibid., p. 441.

b) The State exists as a definite condition of our place in the world, as part of our calling. It is a divine order aiming at service and justice. Therefore everyone who acts in an official capacity has to try to discover the will of God, and every policy and political tendency stands under the judgment of Jesus Christ.[1]

c) The attitude of the Christian who belongs not only to the State but also to the Kingdom of God is a dual one; where his attitude is not a dual one the Christian faith has either become sentimental or it has been secularized.[2]

d) We have to oppose with equal firmness the two main errors, namely: the quietistic conservatism which emphasizes the autonomy of the political sphere of action, to the point of denying that Christian faith either can or should exercise any influence in this sphere at all, and the sentimental radicalism which believes that it can overcome the autonomy of the political sphere by the power of faith, or, if that is impossible, rejects the State as contrary to the will of God.[3]

e) We, as Christians, are called to raise our protest against every form of State absolutism and omnipotence. And it is high time for us to urge and support movements which are aiming at regaining the relative autonomy of the individual spheres.[4]

---

1. Ibid., p. 481.
2. Ibid., p. 460.
3. Ibid., p. 478.
4. Ibid., p. 462 and p. 459.

f) However, Church and State must mutually limit each other's activity, since the Church possesses the right to criticize the moral bases of the State, and may make moral demands on the State; the State, on the other hand, possesses the right to include the members of the Church in her legal system of administration, and to repel the false legal claims of the Church.[1]

It is indisputable, therefore, that Brunner exclusively leaves no room for any absolutism or omnipotence of the State, in spite of the fact that he criticized modern democracy regarding it as "unqualified." Our main question would be, then, how to check the tyranny of autocracy and, at the same time, make democracy more "qualified." The comparatively practical and possible way of solving this problem is to be found in the mutual limitation of each other's activity.

3. William Temple. William Temple is generally recognized as one of the leading teachers of Christian ethics in the world today. He is influential in public opinion, not because he is the Archbishop of York, but because he is practical in dealing with the issues of our lives and challenges of our time. He always appeals to the "feeling" as well as to the minds of the people to whom he offers warning and exhortation. In discussing the application of Christian ethics to social groups, he first calls our attention to a clear classification of groups. According to his analysis, human groups

---

[1] Ibid., p. 554.

may be classified into three types:[1] a) the "natural" group, such as the family, village, town, country, state or nation. Its members are "conscious of a common tradition, a common interest and to some extent, a common purpose"; b) the group of "association" which "represents the voluntary coming together of men for a specific object--the protection of some interest or the promotion of some cause;" c) the group of "fellowship" which is "a group of people whose relation with one another is voluntary in the sense that it is neither a given natural fact, as with the family, nor compulsory as with the criminals collected at any one time in a prison. But it is not voluntary in the sense that it is deliberately planned by its members; rather they find themselves bound to one another by a common response to an ideal or to a leader." Among these three types of groups, he points out that the first one, the natural group will easily display a natural egoism. "In particular the nation is capable of developing an almost overwhelming power of egoistic energy. It has a uniquely penetrating hold upon the loyalty of its citizens, because it appeals to higher and lower nature--to their altruism and their egoism--both at once."[2] In other words the natural community, especially the nation, is the end or the goal of its own being. It serves that end effectively by appealing to the

---

[1] William Temple, Christianity in Thought and Practice, p. 92-93.

[2] Ibid., p. 97.

self-assertiveness of its members and giving an outlet to their generosity and self-sacrifice. Theoretically it is supposed that the egoism existing and developing in the natural community, like that in the family or in a nation, might be checked by membership in some other wider fellowship. However, it is proved by facts that it is comparatively easy to check the family egoism by national loyalty; but it is much harder to check national egoism by any international organization or movements based on cosmopolitanism. Indeed, we find it most difficult, if not impossible, to apply the ethics of the groups of "association" which consist of previously isolated individuals, to the national community which is a product of nature. Moreover, as Christians, we have to concentrate our energy and strengthen our organized movements in the application of Christian ethics to all types of groups under all possible circumstances, no matter how little the achievement may be. According to Archbishop Temple, Christian ethics presents a scale of demands:[1] a) towards God and his Kingdom an absolute surrender; here no individual or group has any rights at all. God's sovereignty is supreme and our allegiance must be unrestricted; b) towards the largest natural community of which we are members an allegiance limited only by our prior allegiance to God and our status as owing that allegiance independently of any lesser loyalty; c) to-

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 103-104.

wards any lesser group an allegiance limited alike by those two prior loyalties and by the function of the group concerned; d) towards another individual a recognition of his interest as standing completely on a level with our own. According to this scale, it is obvious that the national community owes also an absolute allegiance to God. The Archbishop advocates particularly that "the way of love lies through justice" and "justice is more sacred than life,"[1] and emphasizes enthusiastically the real interest and welfare that should be made possible by the community to its members and by the nation to its citizens. In answering the questions, "Is it really to the interest of a debased community, ruled by cruel and self-seeking chieftains, that it should retain its independence when that means perpetuation of those conditions? May it not be more for its interest to come under the tutelage at least of a more civilized neighbor?" he says, "For myself I should say that it would be for its interest to come under that tutelage if the civilized neighbor were going to consider its interest as at least on a level of its own."[2]

Regarding international relations, war and peace, Archbishop Temple expresses the following points of view:

a) One nation may learn from another; but each must

---

[1] Ibid., 92, 110.

[2] Ibid., 105.

remain substantially itself.[1]

b) Generally speaking it can never be more than "relatively right" for a nation to engage in war, but there may be circumstances in relation to which the war becomes absolutely right. For example "to check the aggressor and to set free the oppressed. . . . the success in those aims opens a way for that spiritual activity whereby men may be called to something higher than justice or earthly loyalty. The State must be very sure that it is doing this if it is to justify before God its resort to war."[2]

c) The only way to the full moralization of international life is through an evangelism at home which will make an effective majority of citizens active Christians, a reunion of Christendom which will make each Christian citizen feel his loyalty to the Catholic Church as being prior to his national loyalty. Then the nation may seek to express itself through corporate generosity and sacrifice--or, in other words, through the fulness of love.[3]

Judging by what has been said about Temple's thought, it is clear that his contribution toward democracy lies in, first, the denial of any absolutism of the State which, according to him, owes an absolute allegiance to God; secondly,

---

[1] Ibid., p. 96.

[2] W. Temple, A Conditional Justification of War, pp. 15, 24-25.

[3] Temple, Christianity in Thought and Practice, p. 88.

the emphasis upon justice; thirdly, denunciation of cruel and self-seeking rulers of any community; fourthly, the justification of using force, even means of war, to check the aggressor and free the oppressed; and lastly, the belief in the Christian internationalism which is the higher expression and goal of a national democracy.

4. Reinhold Niebuhr. No one who studies the contemporary American religious thought would fail to recognize the influence of Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr. This is due to the fact that his own work is that of an arresting criticism of Christian social strategy. He is regarded as one who has mediated to America insights which have become common places of European Christianity. He shares the common "dialectic" element with contemporary continental theology. He treats the human situation with a "realistic" view. His emphasis upon the corruption of human nature, human pride, and the "impossible possibility" of the full application of the Christian ethic, is an influential contribution to the "new theology in the making." In one of his popularly enjoyed books, Moral Man and Immoral Society, he points out clearly how the goodness of the individual man in his immediate relationships disappears when he acts as a member of a group, and the devotion of the loyal group member numbs his individual moral sensibilities and renders the group immoral.[1] This means that the personal

---

[1] Reinhold Niebuhr, Moral Man and Immoral Society, pp. xi f., xx, xxiii, 14, 54 f., 266, 272.

ethical relations which are applicable between individuals can hardly be applied in the political relations between social groups. However, Dr. Niebuhr is optimistic enough to believe in a "society in which there will be enough justice, and in which coercion will be sufficiently non-violent to prevent this common enterprise from issuing in complete disaster."[1] For him the future is with the working class and their allies, but he warns us that it will always be possible for them to be driven by mixed motives, and they may blindly overthrow things of permanent moral value. It is important for Christians to offer wise cooperation with or compromise to political movements in any process of social change.

In regard to the relation between Christianity and the State, Dr. Niebuhr complains that most of the orthodox conceptions of "natural law" had a weakness in that they encouraged undue reverence for the political state. According to the orthodox faiths, the State was ordained of God to hold a sinful world in check. He points out that "they were quite willing to criticize a given state if it exceeded its authority, but they did not permit this ethical criticism to become a principle of political action and to counsel rebellion against unjust authority. Again and again Thomas Aquinas, for instance, insists that the coercion which the state uses is justified only if it makes for the welfare of its citizens. But he never

---

[1] Ibid., p.22.

draws the logical conclusion from this that citizens may overthrow a state which ceases to serve their purposes."[1] In his latest book, The Nature and Destiny of Man, he gives a severe attack on the pride of the modern nation which consists in the tendency to make unconditioned claims for its conditioned values. "The significance of this claim is that through it human pride and self-assertion reach their ultimate form and seek to break all bounds of finiteness. The nation pretends to be God."[2] He traces the conflict between prophetic religion and national self-deification back to the day of Amos and of all the great Hebrew prophets. He shows sympathy to Augustine who viewed the destruction of the Roman Empire without despair and answered the charge that Christianity was responsible for its downfall with the assertion that destruction is the very law of life of the "city of this world" and that pride is the cause of its destruction. But he regrets that "this prophetic insight of Augustine's was partially obscured by his identification, however qualified, of the city of God with the historic church, an identification which was later to be stripped of all its Augustinian reservations to become the instrument of the spiritual pride of an empire."[3] Indeed, "the church, as well as the state, can

---

[1] Reinhold Niebuhr, "A Christian Philosophy of Compromise", The Christian Century, Vol. I, No. [illegible], (June 7, 1933).

[2] Reinhold Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man, part I, Human Nature, p. 212.

[3] Ibid., pp. 215-216.

become the vehicle of collective egoism. Every truth can be made the servant of sinful arrogance, including the prophetic truth that all men fall short of the truth. This particular truth can come to mean that, since all men fall short of the truth and since the church is a repository of a revelation which transcends the finiteness and sinfulness of men, it therefore has the absolute truth which other men lack."[1] The world situation today had led Dr. Niebuhr to these conclusions:[2]

a) Since all modern nations, and indeed all nations of history, have been involved in the sin of pride, they are sinful in the sight of God.

b) The modern fascist nations have achieved a demonic form of national self-assertion which is more dangerous even than that of the ancient religious empires because it is expressed within and against the insights of a Christian culture.

c) While Christianity may itself be made the tool of nationalism, the Christian faith, if it retains any vitality, is bound to mediate some word of divine judgment upon the nation.

Thus Niebuhr, on one hand, attacks unreservedly national self-assertion or collective egoism which is essential to the dictatorship of the modern Fascist nations, and on the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 217 [2] Ibid., 219.

other hand, points out the danger of mixed motives of the labouring class and its allies--the "would-be" ruling classes according to Marxists and Socialists--which possibly leads to the dictatorship of the "Proletariat" as in the Communist Russia. By this way, Niebuhr shows us the real enemies of democracy. He suggests further that Christianity, as a prophetic religion, should speak and carry out its divine mission, so that the society of "enough justice" might be brought into existence by neither the Fascist nor the Communist way.

5. Jacques Maritain. Jacques Maritain is a well-known Catholic critic in France. He is recognized by Christian thinkers as an exponent of Neo-Thomism which, un-like the dialectical theology that attempts to turn humanism upside down by denying entirely the good in man and the position of man before God, claims to preserve the dignity of man and rescue the valuable elements in humanistic culture by incorporating them in a new Christian civilization. He and Gilson are regarded by most of the young Catholics as their spiritual leaders. He distinguishes between Catholicism and Catholics, and regards Catholicism as the true religion itself. This makes him liberal enough to answer the question, "Shall they (Catholics) constitute within the State a Catholic Party, a political body Catholic in character and in name?" with these words: "A party which will not seem to be exclusively Catholic or indeed exclusively Christian, but which will

welcome all those who are in fact willing to devote themselves to a definite enterprise in history-making."[1] He believes that a fundamental change in our existing civilization is inevitable, but he has no desire to see the mediaeval supremacy of the Church over the State restored; he only hopes for a day when "an entirely moral and spiritual activity of the Church shall preside over the temporal order of a multitude of politically and culturally heterogeneous nations, whose religious differences are still not likely soon to disappear."[2] In Freedom in the Modern World he goes into the details of the ideal of a new Christendom:[3]

> It seems that the ideal of a new Christendom will admit two different states or aspects according as it has to do on the one hand with bodies of a wholly lay and temporal character belonging to an economic and political order of a Christian complexion; or on the other hand with temporal bodies that are simply instruments of the spiritual power. In the first of these instances the idea of a new Christendom would refer to a politico-economical organization which would guarantee a regular system of cooperation between states, the several members of which would suffer a certain curtailment of sovereignty as the price that has to be paid for the organization of the international community on a foundation of friendship and justice. In the second instance, the idea of a new Christendom would refer to a group of centres of culture and of Christian spirituality spread across the world and receiving their moral (though not their political) unity no longer from a two-fold centre, namely the spiritual centre (to wit the Church) and a temporal centre (to wit the Empire) but from the Church alone as sole spiritual centre. In either view the mental picture that

---

[1] Jacques Maritain, Freedom in the Modern World, pp. 149-150.

[2] Jacques Maritain, Essays in Order, pp. 28-29.

[3] Maritain, Freedom in the Modern World, pp. 107-109.

we form gives us an image or concrete ideal which realizes in essentially different styles the analogical principle of which the idea of the Holy Roman Empire was an early aplication.

For Maritain, "it is to be hoped that the new age of which the first rays are beginning to reach us may be an age not of theocracy or of humanism, but an age more human than humanism and more divine than theocracy; an age in which the dignity and the nobility of creation will more than ever be recognized but in the measure in which creatures are of God and in which He lives in them; humanism, yes, but a humanism of the Incarnation; theocracy, yes, but a theocracy of divine inhabiting the heart."[1]

In regard to ways and means for renewing the temporal order on Christian principles, Maritain expresses the following opinions:

a) The purity and sincerity of an attempt to renew the temporal order on Christian principles excludes all ways and means that are not sincere and pure.[2]

b) We know that the political order and the temporal state are unable to function without the use of coercive force; and that the spiritual power has equally the right, in certain defined cases, to use a measure of coercion; and that force must always be employed as an instrument of justice.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., 159. [2] Ibid., 152.

[3] Ibid., 153.

c) The means to be used must of necessity be consonant with the end in view.[1]

d) Great events of history and great revolutions normally result from a hidden process of growth, from the internal thrust of a new order which takes form and shape and fulfils its own ontological requirements within the heart of a given state of civilization.[2]

e) For one who honestly faces the problem of a Christian State in our time, the question of a complete reform is not to be conceived on the lines that Calvin followed at Geneva, when he asked from the State a greater measure of virtue than is proper to its nature; but we must require that the principle of "the lesser evil" be honestly applied, and that the State itself does not make sin one of its instruments.[3]

f) We must distinguish three incommensurable orders of Means, of which each has its proper law: rich temporal means; poor temporal means; and spiritual mean; or, following a slightly different mode of division, material means; spiritual means directed to the temporal order; purely spiritual means. Each of these orders is subject in its turn to the rule of Christian ethics; and the hierarchy that exists between the orders is inviolable.[4]

g) It is possible that every attempt of the Christian effort to transform the existing world in the secular order

---

[1] Maritain, Freedom in the Modern World, p. 164.

[2] Ibid., 164-165. [3] Ibid., 159-160. [4] Ibid., 163.

may fail, at least as far as outward appearances to. In such a case those who love God would exercise an efficacious--though hidden--influence on the temporal by the use of poor temporal means" not in directly bringing about even a partial reconstruction of the social order, but by fidelity in thought and love and by the touch of faithful hands on the work of a faithless world. Above all, in such a case, their office would be to bear witness to the spiritual order.[1]

It is obvious that Maritain's idea of "an age more human than humanism and more divine than theocracy" is really an age in which Christian principles find fullest expression. Either one of the two aspects concerning the ideal of a new Christendom, as explained by him in terms of cooperation, friendship and justice, is democratic in nature. When comparing his principle that "the means to be used must of necessity be consonant with ends in view" with that of dictators like Mussolini and Stalin who believe in that "end justifies means," we will appreciate much more Maritain's exposition.

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 182, 191.

CONCLUSION

With a glance at the contents of this paper, one would probably feel that it covers too much of the unnecessary materials and misses the mark of presenting the current Christian thinking concerning the relation between Christianity and democracy. However, without making clear first the true nature and meaning of democracy as well as the fundamental faith and principles of Christianity, we will lose the criterion by which we judge the right relation of either one of them to the other. In like manner, without examining historically the relation between democracy and Christianity, our arguments for their relationship will be as abstract as castles built in the air.

Why is democracy attacked? Why are attacks on democracy threats to Christianity? Is it necessary for the "religious" Christianity to share a common destiny with the "political" democracy? These are the questions that lead our Christian thinkers to the examination of the relation between democracy and Christianity and force them to make constructive criticism.

We have seen in the first chapter that democracy is essentially an ethical principle, a moral ideal or a social end rather than any static form of living. It, like the Christian spirit, can exist in any political system and social order if these systems and orders pay primary respect to the

dignity of personality, freedom of individuals and cooperation of organizations, and serve as means for securing welfare of the community. What matters is the spirit, not the form. This is the reason why the contemporary theologians, like Barth, Brunner, Temple, Niebuhr and Maritain, never bother about the forms of government when they deal with the problem of Church and State. They take for granted that democracy may be realized in an aristocratic or democratic republic, or in a monarchy, as the Christian Church may exist under all types of governments.

From this point of view, democracy stands as one of the lifeideals which cannot fail. What has failed is the form expected to be the expression of the ideal, not the ideal itself. Real democracy consists of truth, freedom, justice, goodness and happiness. To say that democracy has failed would be like saying truth, freedom, justice, goodness or happiness has failed. We find an analogy in Christianity. The conventional Church may fail, but the Christian truth can never fail. What has been said about the "secularization of Christianity" is simply the secularization of the life of the Church and its members. I know some people who contrast democracy and Christianity with Utopia and others regard them as "post-dated cheques on the Bank of Futurity." But I am sure no student of history would allow himself to accept this emotional pessimism. I think Count Carlo Sforza is right when he says

that "we were wrong, all of us, if we thought that Democracy is a stable place to reach and to live in, comfortably. The truth is just the contrary. Democracy is a constant creation which each generation must deserve and fight for. Democracy is in front of us, not behind us."[1] As democracy and Christianity have their past, they are surely going to have their future.

However, since the government of a State is the agency responsible for preserving social order, guaranteeing security of its citizens and promoting the life of the people, it should be democratic. Only in a nation where real democracy is carried out through all its political and social systems is human personality normally developed, life ideals effectively uplifted and the physical and the spiritual needs of the people are well met.

But the realization of political democracy in a nation requires at least two preconditions:

1. The cooperation of experts with an educated people. Brunner has suggested that the "concrete purpose" of the State can only be known and realized by experts. But I think that "concrete purpose" can be known and realized in a more desirable and effective way if experts have an educated people to to cooperate with them. Dr. A. D. Lindsay is right when he says, "The expert has to be sensitive to public opinion; the

---

1 Count Carlo Sforza, "Democracy is Stronger", Vital Speeches, Vol. VII, No. 6, (Jan. 1, 1941).

ordinary man has to discuss with some understanding of what the experts' proposals amount to."[1] Indeed a democracy without an educated people will either degenerate into anarchy as a result of disintegrated opinion and will, or serve as a stepping-stone to dictatorship of some leader as a result of the desire of the people to shift the responsibility of government.

2. The free contribution of all kinds of voluntary organizations. By voluntary organizations we mean schools, churches and cultural associations, all of which are regarded by Brunner as "forms of community" as preceding the State and "divine orders of creation." According to Dr. Lindsay, these moral organizations or non-political associations are not only "schools of citizenship" but "they also help to form and make public opinion--to spread among us all that kind of understanding of the common life of society and of the place in it various forms of social activity which will make a really democratic political government possible."[2] We may find a good example in a Congress on Education for Democracy held in New York, August 15 to 17, 1939, under the sponsorship of Teachers' College of Columbia University. All notable statesmen, scholars, scientists, industrialists and Christian leaders were invited to assemble for a serious discussion of education for democracy.

---

1 A. D. Lindsay, The Essentials of Democracy, p. 79.

2 Ibid., pp. 76-77, 80-81.

All contemporary theologians and Christian leaders recognize that the modern totalitarian state attempts to set itself in the place of God, while secular democracy, or "unqualified democracy" as Brunner calls it, fails to be the expression of Christian principles as a divine order. They are aware that through the immense machinery of party, police and propaganda and the new techniques provided by psychology and technical inventions the state is able to control not only men's lives, property and work, but their family, leisure and thought. They know what an unceasing process of repression and stimulation, of suggestion and terrorization would mean to the future of Christianity. It is necessary, therefore, for them to demand spiritual freedom for the Christian Church and to proclaim the Christian attitude towards both national and international affairs.

Thus what we, as Christians, ought to do is (a) secure a satisfactory separation of Church and State; (b) make Christianity a constructive or supporting critic of democracy rather than identifying Christianity with democracy; (c) maintain international tolerance and the unbroken Christian fellowship in a world of hate and conflict.

The Christian Church since it belongs to the spiritual order," is independent of any political machinery. It should be separated ecclesiastically and financially from the

State and recognized by the latter as having the freedom and right to carry out its mission of performing public worship, providing religious education and conducting social service which will meet the spiritual needs of the community. At the same time the Church should neither identify itself with nor become a part of any existing social system, although it may teach and even urge its members to take active part in the most promising political, social, and economic movements. It is under such conditions that Christianity is able to be an objective and constructive critic of democracy and the Church can "mediate some word of divine judgment upon the nation" as advocated by Reinhold Niebuhr.

Since the outbreak of the European War (which is actually a Second World War because of its world-wide influence) the huge shadow of devilish tyranny and general enslavement are falling upon us. We are no longer allowed to discuss merely the "ought-to-be" questions centered around our wishful thinking. We are going to meet the "is" situation with our practical action. We are in a life-and-death struggle for both democracy and Christianity. It is on an equal base that Christians fight for democracy and democrats fight for Christianity. We are going to have a general spiritual mobilization. The first step for us to take is to make Christianity more "Christian" and democracy more "democratic." Then by the mutual stimulation between Christianity

and democracy, the "democratic Christianity" and "Christian democracy" which our contemporary Christian leaders are trying to reconstruct would naturally emerge.

The dark cloud of injustice, hatred, sorrow and fear will also have for us a bright side of hope. And the long night of agony which requires us to pay a heavy price is also a period of purification that leads us to the daylight of a better world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, Lyman. The Spirit of Democracy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1910.

Aulard, A. Christianity and the French Revolution. Boston: Brown, 1927.

Barth, Karl. The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day. New York: Scribner's, 1939.

_____. The Knowledge of God. New York: Scribner's, 1939.

Bennett, John C. Christianity and Our World. New York: Association Press, 1936.

Brown, W. A. Beliefs That Matter. New York: Scribner's, 1928.

Brunner, Emil. The Divine Imperative. Tr. by Olive. New York: Macmillan, 1937.

Calvin, John. Institutes of Christian Religion. Tr. by John Allen. Philadelphia, 1936.

Catlin, George. The Story of the Political Philosophers. New York: Whittlesey House, 1939.

Dewey, John. Democracy of Education. New York: Macmillan, 1924.

Gettell, Raymond G. History of American Political Thought. New York: The Century Company, 1928.

_____. History of Political Thought. New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1924.

Guizot, M. Saint Louis and Calvin. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1868.

Hayes, Carlton J. H. A Political and Social History of Modern Europe. New York: Macmillan, 1928.

Holt, Arthur E. This Nation Under God. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company, 1939.

Horne, Herman Harrell. The Democratic Philosophy of Education. New York: Macmillan, 1932.

Horton, W. M. Contemporary Continental Theology. New York: Harper, 1938.

Jackson, F. J. Foakes. An Introduction to the History of Christianity. New York: Macmillan, 1921.

Jones, Rufus M. Christian Faith in a New Age. New York: Macmillan, 1932.

Kohn, Hans. Revolutions and Dictatorships. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Leighton, Joseph A. Social Philosophies in Conflict. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1937.

Lewis, John. Christianity and the Social Revolution. New York: Scribner's, 1936.

Lindsay, A. D. The Essentials of Democracy. (2nd edition) London: Oxford University Press, 1935.

McIlwain, Charles Howard. The Growth of Political Thought in the West. New York: Macmillan, 1932.

Maritain, Jacques. Freedom in the Modern World. Tr. by Richard O'Sullivan. New York: Scribner's, 1936.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. The Nature and Destiny of Man. (I Human Nature) New York: Scribner's, 1941.

_____. Moral Man and Immoral Society. New York: Scribner's, 1932.

Randall, John Herman, Jr. The Making of the Modern Mind. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1926.

Rauschenbusch, W. Christianity and the Social Crisis. New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1911.

Richardson, Cyril Charles. The Church Through the Centuries. New York: Scribner's, 1938.

Temple, William. Christianity in Thought and Practice. New York: Morehouse Publishing Company, 1936.

_____. A Conditional Justification Of War. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1940.

Thompson, J. W. and E. N. Johnson. An Introduction to Medieval Europe. New York: Norton, 1937.

Vlastos, Gregory. Christian Faith and Democracy. New York: Association Press, 1940.

Ward, Harry F. Democracy and Social Change. New York: Modern Age Books, Inc., 1940.

Weyl, Walter E. The New Democracy. New York: Macmillan, 1913.

Wood, H. G. Christianity and Communism. New York: Round Table Press, 1933.

CONFERENCE REPORTS

The Christian Message. Jerusalem meeting of the International Missionary Council. Vol. I. New York: International Missionary Council, 1928.

The Oxford Conference. Official Report. Chicago: Willett and Clark, 1937.

The World Mission of the Church. Findings and Recommendations of the International Missionary Council, Madras, India, 1938. New York: International Missionary Council, 1939.

The Church and a New World Order. Full Text of the Malvern Conference, published in the Christian Century, Vol. LVIII, No. 8, Feb. 19, 1941.

PERIODICALS

Adams, James Truslow. "Shield of Our Liberty: The Bill of Rights," The New York Times Magazine. Nov. 20, 1938; condensed in Reader's Digest Vol. 34, No. 201, Jan. 1939.

Aubrey, Edwin E. "Religion and the Democratic Dream," The Christian Century. Vol. LVIII, No. 36, Sept. 4, 1940.

Bennett, John C. "Christianity and Democracy," Christendom. Vol. 5, No. 2, Spring 1940.

_____. "I Believe," Intercollegian and Far Horizons. Vol. 57, No. 2, Nov. 1937.

Blight, Reynold E. "The Constitution and Totalitarianism," The New Age. July, 1938; condensed in Religion, A Digest, Vol. 1, No. 1, Jan. 1939.

Boas, George. "A Defense of Democracy," Harpers Magazine. Vol. 169, September, 1934.

Case, Shirley Jackson. "Religion and Democracy," Religion in the Making. Vol. 1, No. 1, May 1940.

Hisel, Paul R. "Internationalism and Democracy," Personalist. Winter, 1940.

Lowell, A. Lawrence. "The Present Crisis in Democracy," Foreign Affairs. Vol. 12, No 2, Jan. 1934.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. "A Christian Philosophy of Compromise," The Christian Century. Vol. L, No. 23, June 7, 1933.

Perry, Ralph Barton. "The Alleged Failure of Democracy," The Yale Review. Autumn, 1934; reprinted in American Points of View 1934-1935.

Sforza, Count Carlo. "Democracy is Stronger," Vital Speeches of the Day. Vol. VII, No. 6, Jan. 1, 1941.

Sims, Newell L. "Democracy under Three Different Cultures," American Sociological Review. Feb. 1940.

Sullivan, Mark. "Uproot the Seeds of Totalitarianism," The New York Herald Tribune. August 26, 1939; condensed in Reader's Digest Vol 35, No. 210, Oct. 1939.

Voorhis, Jerry. "Attack on Democracy," Intercollegian and Far Horizons. Vol. 57, No. 2, Nov. 1939.

Weigle, Luther A. "Democracy, Education and Faith," Yale Divinity News. Vol. 37, No. 1, Nov. 1940.

Zimmern, Alfred. "Two Types of Democracy," The Congregational Quarterly. Vol. 18, No. 2.

End of

The literary structure of Joel 1:1 - 2:27

Bound volume is continued by

Brunner's criticism of Schleiermacher

The current Christian thinking concerning the relation between Christianity and democracy

Search by title on archive.org to continue reading this collection of Pacific School of Religion Theses from 1941, call number Thesis Cage 1941 v.1